GREEK READERS' DIGESTS?

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM SEPTUAGESIMUM QUINTUM

MONIQUE VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK

GREEK READERS' DIGESTS?

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

GREEK READERS' DIGESTS?

STUDIES ON A SELECTION OF SUBLITERARY PAPYRI

BY

MONIQUE VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK

BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1998

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rossum-Steenbeek, Monique van.
Greek readers' digests? : studies on a selection of subliterary papyri / by Monique van Rossum-Steenbeek.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 175)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004109536 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Popular literature—Greece—History and criticism. 2. Greek literature—History and criticism. 3. Manuscripts, Greek (Papyri) 4. Books and reading—Greece. I. Title. II. Series.
PA3074.R67 1997
880.9'001—dc21 97-27178
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
175. Rossum-Steenbeek, Monique van: Greek readers' digests?. –1997

Rossum-Steenbeek, Monique van:
Greek readers' digests? : studies on a selection of subliterary papyri / by Monique van Rossum-Steenbeek. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1997
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 175)
ISBN 90-04-10953-6

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10953 6

© Copyright 1998 by Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements IX

Note on abbreviations XI

PART ONE

Introduction XIII

Chapter One: Hypotheses to tragedies and comedies 1
1 Narrative hypotheses 1
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Characteristics 4
1.3 Papyri 12
1.4 Comparative survey of papyri **1-18** 22
1.5 Origin and transmission 24
1.6 Connection with Ps.-Apollodorus and Ps.-Hyginus . . . 25
1.7 Function and readership 31
2 Learned hypotheses 32
2.1 Introduction 32
2.2 Papyri 34
2.3 Function and readership 36
3 Descriptive hypothesis 37
3.1 Introduction 37
3.2 Papyrus 37
3.3 Function and readership 39
4 Menandrean hypotheses 39
4.1.1 Introduction to prose hypotheses 39
4.1.2 Introduction to metrical hypotheses 40
4.2 Papyri 41
4.3 Function and readership 44
5 Comparative survey of papyri **19-28** 45
6 Doubtful papyri 46
7 Conclusions 47

Chapter Two: Homeric hypotheses and callimachean diegeses . . 53
1 Homeric hypotheses 53
1.1 Introduction 53

1.2 Papyri 55
1.3 Comparative survey of papyri 65
1.4 Hypotheses in the medieval manuscripts 67
1.5 More Homeric summaries 69
1.6 Function and readership 73
2 Callimachean diegeses 74
2.1 Introduction 74
2.2 Papyri 75
2.3 Comparative survey of papyri 80
2.4 Function and readership 81
3 Conclusions 81

Chapter Three: Mythographus homericus 85
1 Introduction 85
2 Characteristics 86
3 Papyri 92
4 Comparative survey of papyri 101
5 Connections between papyri, scholia and Ps.-Apollodorus . 103
5.1 Comparison scholia - papyri 103
5.2 Scholia and Ps.-Apollodorus 108
6 Subscriptions 111
7 Origin 113
8 Date 115
9 Conclusions 116

Chapter Four: Catalogues 119
1 Introduction 119
2 Papyri 121
3 Comparative survey of papyri 148
3.1 Provenance, date, hand, lectional signs, layout 148
3.2 Contents 150
4 Comparison with Ps.-Hyginus' *Fabulae* 151
5 Conclusions 154

Conclusions 157

Appendix One: Notes on three mythographic writings 164
1 Ps.-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 164
2 Ps.-Hyginus' *Fabulae* 169
3 Parthenius' *Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων* 172

Appendix Two: *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* and Apd. *Epit.* 4, 3-7 . . 176

PART TWO

Note on the texts 183

Papyri 185

Bibliography 341

Indices 349
Index of papyri 349
Index of passages 351
Index of names and subjects 354

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to many people who assisted me during my Ph.D. research at the University of Groningen, of which this book is the result. First of all, I wish to thank Prof. Dr. M.A. Harder who encouraged me to enter into research and with whom I had numerous enjoyable and constructive discussions on earlier versions. I have profited much from the learning and valuable criticisms of Prof. Dr. J.N. Bremmer, Prof. M.W. Haslam, Prof. Dr. C.H. Kneepkens, Prof. Dr. S.L. Radt, and Prof. Dr. S.R. Slings, who all read the entire manuscript, and of Prof. Dr. D. Holwerda who commented upon a draft of Chapter Three. I am also indebted to Dr. P. Hatlie who made time to correct my English in the first part of this book.

Thanks to grants of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), I was able to inspect papyri in Berlin and to stay three months in Oxford surrounded by interesting papyri and papyrologists. I am grateful to Dr. R.A. Coles, Prof. D. Obbink, and Dr. J.R. Rea for their professional assistance and the pleasant conversations we had, and I am particularly indebted to Prof. P.J. Parsons for his friendly and stimulating guidance during my visit.

For providing photographs, giving information or checking readings in the original papyri, I am grateful to Dr. I. Andorlini and Prof. M. Manfredi (Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli"), Dr. D.M. Bain (The University of Manchester), Dr. C. Balconi (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano), Th.M. Christensen and Prof. Dr. A. Bülow-Jacobsen (Kopenhagen), Dr. R. Cribiore (Columbia University, New York), Prof. J. Diggle (Queens' College, Cambridge), Dr. T. Gagos (University of Michigan), Prof. J. Gascou (Institut de Papyrologie, Strasbourg), Dr. H. Harrauer (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien), Dr. M. Huys and T. Idgenhorst (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), Prof. R. Kannicht (Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen), Dr. J. Lightfoot (All Souls College, Oxford), Prof. Dr. W. Luppe (Martin-Luther-Universität Halle), Dr. A. Malnati (Istituto di papirologia, Università degli studi di Milano), P. van Minnen (Special Collections Library Durham), Dr. G. Poethke (Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Berlin), and Dr. K.A. Worp (Universiteit van Amsterdam). Two librarians of the Buma Bibliotheek in Leeuwarden, A. Dijkstra and A. Hibma, deserve special mention for the outstanding service they gave in the past five years.

Though many colleagues and friends showed welcome interest in the progress of my work, I only record the pleasant company of Adrie van der Laan with whom I shared a room and a computer. I also wish to thank my parents and family for their ongoing moral support and concern, especially because the contents of this book must have been far less manifest for them than other scholarly activities. Finally, I owe my husband Joris deep gratitude for his patience with me and my dedication to my work.

Zwolle, summer 1997

NOTE ON ABBREVIATIONS

Greek and Latin authors and their works are cited in accordance with LSJ or *OLD*. Titles of periodicals are abbreviated according to Marouzeau, *L'Année Philologique*, and indications of papyri are adopted from the *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca* (3rd ed.), *BASP* 4. Abbreviations that have been used to indicate books are incorporated in the bibliography.

I hope that most of the abbreviations in this book will be clear; some special abbreviations are:

Apd. = Ps.-Apollodorus
App. = Appendix
cod(d). = codex/codices
col. = column
Hyg. = Ps.-Hyginus
hyp(p). = hypothesis/hypotheses
med. = medieval
MH = Mythographus Homericus
ms(s). = manuscript(s)
pap. = papyrus
sch. = scholia

INTRODUCTION

The main point of interest in this book are four groups of Greek subliterary papyri: papyri with *hypotheses* (henceforth *hypp.*)[1] of tragedies and comedies, Homeric *hypp.* and Callimachean *diegeses*, stories of the Mythographus Homericus, and mythical catalogues. The most obvious thing they have in common is the qualification 'subliterary'. Although this term has been applied to many papyri, no precise definition for it exists. Subliterary papyri can be described as a subcategory of literary papyri because, on the one hand and in contrast to documentary papyri, the texts are usually written in literary hands and their contents have certain links with literary texts. On the other hand, the texts are not considered literary themselves because they do not belong to one of the traditional literary genres in view of their contents and/or style and because they give no evidence of literary pretentions. There are far more subliterary papyri than the four groups mentioned above. Examples are scholia, commentaries, glossaries, paraphrases, and so on. Whereas the nature of most subliterary texts is rather straightforward, the four selected groups of papyri seem to present a kind of readers' digest containing noteworthy knowledge.

The aim of this study is to test the validity of a supposition proposing that the four groups of papyrus texts were written in order to make it unnecessary for people to read the original writings on which the papyrus texts are based. This idea originated from the prologues of two ancient writings whose contents seem comparable at first sight.[2] The first prologue stems from Ps.-Apollodorus *Bibliotheca* (henceforth Apd. *Bibl.*), a mythographic writing which will often be adduced in this study for comparison with the papyri.[3] Fortunately,

---

[1] The term *hypothesis* is a transliteration of the Greek ὑπόθεϲιϲ (cf. p. 1) and has nothing to do with the modern connotations of the word.

[2] Whereas the idea that papyrus texts are designed to make the reading of earlier writings superfluous is not new (cf. p. 51 n. 109), their contents are not often connected with ancient sources, but cf. Zuntz (1955: 138 n. 4) who draws attention to Ps.-Apollodorus' epigram (cited below) in order to illustrate the attitude of the reader of Homeric and Euripidean summaries.

[3] The book is introduced and compared to one group of *hypp.* on p. 26ff. For its position among other compendia, cf. p. 157. See further p. 70ff., 103ff. and App. One 1.

Photius *Bibl.* 186 (end) describes the contents and nature of the *Bibl.* and quotes the following introductory epigram, which is not preserved in the mss. of the *Bibl.*:

αἰῶνος cπείρημα ἀφυccάμενος ἀπ' ἐμεῖο
παιδείηc, μύθουc γνῶθι παλαιγενέαc,
μηδ' ἐc 'Ομηρείην cελίδ' ἔμβλεπε μηδ' ἐλεγείην,
μὴ τραγικὴν Μοῦcαν, *μηδὲ μελογραφίην,*
μὴ κυκλίων ζήτει πολύθρουν cτίχον· εἰc ἐμὲ δ' ἀθρῶν
εὑρήcειc ἐν ἐμοὶ πάνθ' ὅcα κόcμοc ἔχει.[4]

Draw your knowledge of the past from me and come to know (Diller has 'read') the ancient tales of learned lore. Look neither at the page of Homer, nor of elegy, nor tragic muse, nor lyric strain. Seek not the vaunted verse of the cycle; but look in me and you will find in me all that the world contains.

This epigram leaves no doubt about the encyclopedic intention: the reader is invited to draw his/her entire mythical knowledge from the writing of Apd., aptly called *Bibliotheca*, and to discard the original poetical works.

The second prologue stems from Parthenius' Περὶ *ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων*, a collection of thirty-six prose stories about the misfortunes of lovers written in the first century BC.[5] The purpose of this book is explicitly stated:

Μάλιcτα cοὶ *δοκῶν ἁρμόττειν*, Κορνήλιε Γάλλε, *τὴν ἄθροιcιν τῶν ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων ἀναλεξάμενοc ὡc ὅτι πλεῖcτα ἐν βραχυτάτοιc ἀπέcταλκα.*[6] *τὰ γὰρ παρά τιcι τῶν ποιητῶν κείμενα τούτων, μὴ αὐτοτελῶc λελεγμένα, κατανοήcειc ἐκ τῶνδε τὰ πλεῖcτα· αὐτῶι τέ cοι παρέcται εἰc ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείαc ἀνάγειν τὰ μάλιcτα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἁρμόδια.* ⟨*μηδὲ*⟩ *διὰ τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι τὸ περιττὸν αὐτοῖc, ὃ δὴ cὺ μετέρχηι, χεῖρον περὶ αὐτῶν ἐννοηθῆιc· οἱονεὶ γὰρ ὑπομνηματίων τρόπον αὐτὰ cυνελεξάμεθα, καὶ* cοὶ *νυνὶ τὴν χρῆcιν ὁμοίαν, ὡc ἔοικε, παρέξεται.*

---

[4] Photius' text is quoted from the edition by Henry (1962); the following translation is by Diller (1935: 300). See also Cameron (1995: 398), who proposes the reading *κυκλικῶν* instead of *κυκλίων* (l. 5). He further argues that the epigram is early and should not be classified as Byzantine, as he did in his *Greek Anthology* 333.

[5] For a discussion of the contents, syntax and vocabulary of Parthenius' book, cf. App. One 3; see p. 158 on its position among other compendia. The following text is quoted according to Martini (1902).

[6] Instead of *ἀπέcταλκα* printed in the editions, St. Radt suggests in a private note the reading *ἐπέcταλκα*.

> Thinking, Cornelius Gallus, that the collection of the Erotika Pathemata was a very suitable thing for me to offer you, I have collected them and send them to you in as brief a form as possible. For those stories among the present collection, which occur in certain poets where they are not narrated completely,[7] you will find out for the most part from here. You (too/yourself) will be able to render the most suitable of them into hexameters and elegiacs. Think none the worse of them because they lack that quality of refined elaboration which you pursue. For I have collected them after the fashion of a little notebook, and they will, I trust, serve you in the same way.[8]

This prooemium thus illustrates that the simple stories about love were derived from poetic sources offered for use to the poet Gallus. Parthenius' writing differs from that of Apd. because it is composed for a practical purpose, whereas the knowledge in the *Bibl.* is presented for its own sake.[9] Although Apd. and Parthenius wrote their books for different purposes, both writings provide the readers with easily accessible knowledge that saves them the trouble of reading or consulting more original literary texts.

In order to test the validity of the idea that the papyrus texts serve similar encyclopedic or practical purposes, the following questions are explored for each group of papyri: what kind of information is transmitted in the papyri and how is this done? How are their contents related to other literature? What do we know about the function and readership of these papyri? Comparable questions have been asked before, but usually in respect of one papyrus or a small group of related papyri. I hope to present a more precise and comprehensive picture based on a comparative and systematic examination of all the relevant papyri known to me. The question of whether the papyrus texts may be qualified as a kind of readers' digests in the modern sense of the word will be investigated in the final conclusions (cf. p. 161).

In the course of my research it occurred to me that the four groups of subliterary papyri were so different that it seemed prefer-

[7] Instead of completely, αὐτοτελῶϲ can also mean independently, separately. In contrast to the second translation, the first seems to imply that Parthenius added information to the stories found in the poets.

[8] J. Lightfoot kindly permitted me to print the translation she made for her own book "Parthenius of Nicaea", which will probably appear in 1998.

[9] It is obvious that Parthenius' collection has not been used exclusively by Gallus: otherwise it would not have been transmitted to us in a tenth century ms. It is even possible that Parthenius' book came to be read for its own sake, undergoing a similar change in usage as the historical epitome (cf. p. 158).

able to answer the questions formulated above for each group individually. Besides, it seemed useful to include the texts of all papyri because their editions are distributed in many books and periodicals. This has resulted in the present structure of this book, which is divided into two parts: the first part consists of four separate chapters followed by a brief conclusion, and the second part presents all papyrus texts discussed in the first part. The contents of each chapter of Part One differ in accordance with the specific character of the papyri, their relationship with other literature, the absence or presence of previous studies on the same subject, and so forth. But each chapter contains at least the following sections: a brief introduction, a discussion of the papyri, notes on comparable literature, and conclusions. In the discussion of the papyri,[10] attention is paid both to the contents and to matters of provenance, date, hands, format and use of lectional signs. As to the description of the physical aspects and contents, the text of the *editio princeps* will be freely paraphrased, translated, summarized and cited without reference to it. When statements are derived from later publications, these will be mentioned.

The first chapter deals with *hypp.* to tragedies and comedies. The papyri preserve several types, which are not equally well represented. The main group consists of *hypp.* that are often indicated as 'Tales from Euripides' but will be called 'narrative *hypp.*' in this study for reasons to be stated later in the brief introduction on p. 1. As the contents of the papyri with narrative *hypp.* are quite uniform, this introduction is followed by a discussion of the contents, syntax and vocabulary in general. As a consequence, the descriptions of the individual papyri are kept to a minimum unless the papyri appear to deviate from the usual characteristics. Sections on both the relationship of the papyri to the mythographic handbooks of Apd. and Hyg., and the function and readership of the papyri, conclude the first part of this chapter.

The second part discusses ten papyri which contain different types of *hypp.*: learned *hypp.* to tragedies, one descriptive *hyp.* to a comedy, and prose and metrical *hypp.* to plays of Menander. The most obvious

[10] The remains of some papyri are so fragmentary that their identity or precise nature cannot be established with absolute certainty. Examples are papyri **11** and **57** which both contain mythical stories: the first may be a *hyp.* of a tragedy and the second may belong to the MH collection, but conclusive evidence is lacking. Such papyri are nevertheless included and discussed for the sake of completeness.

feature of the learned *hypp.* is the presence of learned notes such as historical information on the performance and date of the play, whereas its summary is of minor importance. The *hyp.* to Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* is called 'descriptive' because the text actually describes the performance of the play. Only this type contains references to activities on the stage. The prose *hypp.* to Menander consist of summaries of plays which are roughly comparable to the narrative *hypp.*, accompanied by didascalic information and an aesthetic evaluation. The most conspicuous characteristic of the metrical *hypp.* is the fact that they are written in iambic trimeters. This enumeration only glances at some of the most obvious matters. Important differences are also caused by the transmission of the texts: two types form part of a large collection of *hypp.* ordered alphabetically. Other *hypp.* are transmitted together with the text of the plays. A more extensive survey with comparisons and conclusions is given at the end of the first chapter.

The second chapter is concerned with Homeric *hypp.* and Callimachean *diegeses*. Both groups consist of summaries of earlier poetry preceded by *incipits*. The Homeric summaries quote first lines of books of *Il.* and *Od.*, the *diegeses* quote the beginnings of (sections of) Callimachus' poems. Both the first and the second part of this chapter contain the description of the papyri preceded by a general introduction and followed by a section on the function and readership. The Homeric *hypp.* show large differences not only in the way they have been transmitted—alone, or in collections of *hypp.*, with or without glossaries, in school hands or in elegant scripts—but also in their selection of contents, length and style. This diversity of contents is also found in the *hypp.* preserved in med. mss. A comparison of the *hypp.* with other Homeric summaries in Apd., Hyg., *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*, Ps.-Ausonius and Ps.-Dositheus will bring the peculiarities of each text to light. The part on the Callimachean *diegeses* will be shorter because there are less papyri and less additional comparative material.

Chapter Three discusses papyri with mythical stories (*historiae*) which form part of a larger collection of such stories linked to Homer. The name Mythographus Homericus (henceforth MH) is generally used to indicate the author of this collection, which is preserved not only in the papyri but also in med. scholia. The papyri provide a uniform picture of the *historiae*: they are mythical prose accounts about persons, places, institutions or other issues mentioned in the lemmata (quotations of Homeric verses) that connect the stories with

and follow the order of the Homeric text. Most *historiae* end with a subscription that refers to previous literature.

A more precise description divided into parts—on contents, syntax and vocabulary—precedes the description of the individual papyri. Thereafter sections are devoted to more specific and sometimes much disputed issues including med. scholia compared with papyri and Apd., subscriptions, origin, and date. Notably the part which compares scholia and papyri leads to interesting conclusions. Since previous studies have not paid due attention to the fact that the scholia have mixed the *historiae* with other material, many scholia are wrongly qualified as *historiae* of the MH. This insight, it will be argued, also leads to doubts about the traditional view on the relationship between the MH and Apd. The final section with conclusions incorporates suggestions on function and readership.

Mythographical catalogues form the subject of the fourth chapter. Such catalogues or lists form an important component of ancient literature and deal with a variety of subjects. A brief introduction on the types of catalogues precedes the discussion of the individual papyri. Some papyri contain several catalogues, while others preserve only remains of one. Some catalogues consist of names, such as names of Actaeon's dogs, others have more extensive entries, for example the list of Argonauts, which enumerates not only Argonauts but also their fathers and homeland. The order of entries may reflect the order of previous literature or it may have an alphabetical, numerical or arbitrary order. In short, the catalogues show a large diversity in subjects, length and arrangement. Their contents will be compared with other catalogues and relevant literature in order to establish their position in the literary tradition. A separate section is devoted to Hyg. *Fab.* since this book forms the closest parallel to the papyri with catalogues. The last paragraph presents conclusions on the kind of information transmitted in the papyri and on their function and readership.

A brief survey presenting the main results concludes Part One of this book. Part Two contains all papyrus texts discussed in the first part. Although the papyri have already been published in various books and periodicals, they have never been brought together. It is therefore hoped that the present collection will be a useful instrument for future research and a convenient aid to the reader. Papyri are referred to by means of bold printed numbers to avoid repetitions of lengthy papyrus indentifiers. Although revisions of the texts were not envisaged at the beginning of this research, inspection of about half of

the papyri yielded several improvements with regard to previous editions.[11] These will therefore be presented to the reader. Information about the presentation of the papyrus texts can be found in a short introduction at the beginning of the second part.

[11] See e.g. 6, 6; 53 passim; 61, 8; 63, 26ff.; 65, 19; 69, 89.

CHAPTER ONE

HYPOTHESES TO TRAGEDIES AND COMEDIES

Already in antiquity different meanings were attached to the word ὑπόθεcιc regarding dramatic poetry.[1] On the one hand, it referred to an introduction to a tragedy or comedy, on the other hand, to a short summary in prose or poetry of the contents of a play. Refining this broad division, Budé distinguished several types,[2] some of which are also transmitted to us in the papyri. The following types will be discussed: narrative and learned *hypp.* to tragedies, one descriptive *hyp.* of a comedy, and prose and metrical *hypp.* to plays of Menander.[3]

1 Narrative hypotheses

1.1 Introduction

Instead of the frequently used name 'Tales from Euripides', the title 'narrative *hypotheses*' is preferable for two reasons:[4] first, this type

---

[1] See Budé (29-32), and on ὑπόθεcιc in a wider context, Holwerda (1976: 173-198) and Meijering (1987: 107ff.).

[2] This chapter will generally follow the distinctions made by Budé, but the groups are called differently. Budé's study (completed in 1977) consists of a survey of the results of previous research on various types of *hypp.* and secondly, of an attempt to identify Dicaearchus' *hypp.* which are in his opinion not the 'Tales from Euripides'. On this type and on the terminology, see §1.1 below. My first chapter owes much to the first part of Budé's book, in which there is an extensive bibliography. However, the present study is justified not only by the appearance of many new publications on this subject since 1977, but also by the discussion and inclusion of all relevant papyrus texts, seven of which were published after 1977, cf. **4**, **5**, **7**, **10**, **14**, **17**, **25**.

[3] Whereas subchapters 2-4 consist of three parts, viz. an introduction, a discussion of the papyri and a section on function and readership, 1 contains both these and the following sections: a general discussion of the characteristics of the papyri divided in parts on contents, syntax and vocabulary, a comparative survey of papyri **1-18**, and sections on origin and transmission and on the connection with Apd. and Hyg. The last paragraph (7), with conclusions, is preceded by a comparative survey of papyri **19-28** and a short discussion of some papyri which have been connected with *hypp.* of plays.

[4] For this type of *hypp.*, cf. Budé (48-52) who adopts the indication 'Tales from Euripides' first used by Zuntz (1955: 135ff.). The term 'narrative *hypp.*' has

comprises not only *hypp.* to the plays of Euripides, but also *hypp.* to plays of Sophocles.[5] Second, this title reflects both the words ἡ δ(ὲ) ὑπόθεϲιϲ by which the summaries are introduced in the papyri, and their narrative character.

The narrative *hypp.* usually consist of the following elements: the play's title followed by οὗ/ἧϲ/ὧν ἀρχή on the first line, the citation of the first verse on the second line,[6] the words ἡ δ(ὲ) ὑπόθεϲιϲ, mostly indented like the title, on the third line, and then the *hyp.* itself, which is a short[7] prose summary of the contents of the tragedy without either any didascalic information or reference to the author or the play as such. The events are presented in a chronological order without long descriptions, comments by a narrator, or direct speeches by actors.

These *hypp.* stem from collections of *hypp.* ordered alphabetically by the first letter of the play's title.[8] Although the question of authorship has given rise to many discussions, there is a general consensus that most *hypp.* in the papyri ultimately stem from one collection

---

been used before: Budé uses the term to designate the group which is here called 'descriptive *hypp.*' (see p. 37ff.), and Van Hemelryck (1979: 289ff.) employs the Dutch indication 'narratieve tragediehypotheseis' for the same group of *hypp.* as I do.

[5] The papyri with Euripidean *hypp.* (**1**-**16**) outweigh those with Sophoclean *hypp.* (**17**-**18**), which may be due to the fact that Euripides was more widely read than Sophocles. For Euripides' popularity, cf. Turner (1968: 97), the number of papyri listed in Pack and Krüger (1990: 214), and the table in Montevecchi (1973: 360-363).

[6] Nachmanson (1941: 38-47) gives many examples of such *incipits* and shows that already Aristotle used the expression οὗ ἡ ἀρχή plus citation to identify a work, cf. *Rh.* 3, 17, 1418b 30 ... καὶ τὸν Χάρωνα τὸν τέκτονα ἐν τῶι ἰάμβωι, οὗ (ἡ) ἀρχή· οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω. See also *Ath.* 5, 2 ... τὴν ἐλεγείαν ἧϲ ἐϲτὶν ἀρχή· γιγνώϲκω, καί μοι φρενὸϲ ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κεῖται ... Such *incipits* were also used by Callimachus in his *Pinakes*, whereafter the method became more widespread, cf. Nachmanson (1941: 46-47).

[7] Luppe (1988: 27-33) reasonably estimates the usual length of these *hypp.* inclusive heading at thirty-three to forty-two lines of twenty-seven to thirty-one letters.

[8] The only exception is **9**, which has a thematic rather than an alphabetical order. Daly (1967: 24-25) argues that the alphabetic order of the *hypp.* in **1a**, **12**, **16**, and **26** (in addition to other evidence listed on the preceding pages) also suggests that the principle of alphabetic arrangement was put to use by the Alexandrians in order to organize and classify the literature of the great libraries. Cf. Turner (1962: 136), Pfeiffer (1968: 195) and in general Blum (1977).

written by one person.[9] Whereas some scholars consider Dicaearchus of Messene, a pupil of Aristotle, as the author,[10] others refute this identification. It appears that the texts adduced as evidence for Dicaearchus' authorship are less conclusive than was first thought.[11] We may conclude that Dicaearchus wrote *hypp.* to plays of Euripides and Sophocles, and that the papyri probably but not necessarily contain his *hypp.*[12]

But what can we deduce about the date of the original collection from the text of the *hypp.*? Zuntz (1955: 138-139) suggests the first century BC in view of the similar contents and style of the *Tabulae Iliacae* from Augustus' time (cf. p. 70) and the works of Parthenius and Diodorus. Krenn (1971) also favours the first century BC on the basis of his stylistic analysis. The *hypp.* show indeed many features of late Hellenistic prose but there remain two uncertain elements. What do we actually know about the style of subliterary texts composed in the fourth or third century BC? Second, how meaningful is the presence of late expressions and grammatical constructions? These may have crept into the text in the course of transmission. In short, my conclusion on the date remains vague in order to avoid speculation: this collection has come into being between the 'invention' of alphabetical order[13] and the first century of our era, to which the earliest

---

[9] This idea is based on the recurring characteristics of the *hypp.*, not only in the papyri but also in other mss., cf. §1.5. Papyrus evidence suggests that the collection of *hypp.* was arranged alphabetically when it was created.

[10] Gallavotti (1933: 188); Haslam (1975: 150-156 and 1994: 211); Luppe (1985: 610-612 and 1990: 11-13).

[11] Against Dicaearchus' authorship are: Zuntz (1955: 143-146); Budé (esp. 173ff.); Rusten (1982: 357-367); Kassel (1985: 53-59); Carrara (1992: 35-44); Huys (1997 *RhM*). Before the status of the textual evidence—Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 3.3 and the *hyp.* to *Rhesus* in the med. mss., cf. Nauck F 1108 = *TrGF* 2 F 81 p. 19—was doubted by Kassel, Rusten suggested that the name Dicaearchus became falsely attached to the collection of *hypp.* in view of other writings that were wrongly ascribed to famous authors, cf. e.g. Apd. *Bibl.* and Hyg. *Fab.*, which are both discussed on p. 25ff.

[12] There are more examples of authors whose writings on tragedies have obscure contents: *P.Oxy.* 18, 2192, a letter of the second century AD, mentions *λόγου ἐ̣π̣ιτο̣μὰc τῶν* Θερcαγόρου *τῶν τραγικῶν μύθων*, i.e. prose epitomes of Thersagoras' work on the myths of tragedy; Heraclides of Pontus is said to have written "main points", cf. *PCG* 2 Antiphanes fr. 111: *ὁ τὰ κεφάλαια cυγγράφων* Εὐ*ριπίδηι*; and cf. *FGrHist* 76 F 29 Duris of Samos' Περὶ Εὐ*ριπίδου καὶ* Cοφοκλέουc.

[13] Rusten (1982: 363-364) argues that the alphabetic order speaks against Dicaearchan authorship because alphabetization was rare, if not unknown, before the third century, cf. n. 8. Luppe (1985: 612) tries to counter this argument by pointing out that the absence of proof does not necessarily mean that Dicaear-

papyrus (8) has been assigned. Our knowledge of Peripatetic writings and early scholarship in general is too limited to argue that either the contents or the style or the alphabetic order and the use of *incipits*, speak for or against Dicaearchus.

1.2 Characteristics

The following description of the contents, syntax and vocabulary of the narrative *hypp.* is restricted to the papyri, including supplements only when these are fairly certain.[14] Some of the smaller papyri (e.g. **2**, **3**, **5**, **7**, **11**) are so fragmentary that nothing can be said other than that their characteristics seem to be compatible. Several papyri appear to deviate in one or more aspects, cf. the survey on p. 24. The description is offered as a database of information both for internal and external use: this general survey prevents me from repeating comparable information in the descriptions of the individual papyri, where attention will be drawn to notable features, and the information may be of use in future research on these texts.

1.2.1 Contents

Many *hypp.* start with the name of an important person and some details about his or her family and social and geographical position, cf. *Phrixus* I (**16** fr. 14.3) Ἀθάμας υἱὸς μὲ̣[ν] ἦν Αἰόλου· βασιλεὺς δ̣ὲ Θετταλία̣ς̣· [εἶχε(ν)] δὲ παῖδα̣[ς] ἐκ [Νε]φέλης Ἕ̣λλη[ν τε κ]α̣ὶ Φρίξον.[15] Other introductions are less informative but they usually mention the main character(s) and situation, cf. *Ba.* (**4**, 21ff.) Δ̣ι[ό]νυ̣ς̣ο̣ν ο̣ἱ̣ π̣ροσήκοντες ἐν Θήβ[αις οὐκ ἔφ]η̣ς̣ε̣ν̣ (ἔφασαν mss.) εἶναι θ̣ε̣ό̣ν̣·

---

chus did not use an alphabetic order. Moreover, Haslam (1994: 211) observes that "4th-cent. pinakia and inventories show that by Dikaiarchos' time alphabetization—the sequential use of the letters of the alphabet for organizational purposes—had been in use in Athens for years."

[14] Only the papyrus texts are discussed because the *hypp.* on papyrus are often different from those in med. mss., and because a study on the contents, syntax and vocabulary of the narrative *hypp.* transmitted in the med. mss. already exists, cf. Krenn (1971). Luppe often discusses typical expressions for the purpose of establishing the text (cf. e.g. 1983 *Phil.*: 158ff. and 1994: 33-34).

[15] Cf. **14** which overlaps with this text. See also **1a**, 21ff.; **8**, 6ff.; **16** fr. 2, 1ff., fr. 5, 10ff., fr. 14.4, 10-11, fr. 17.2, 7ff.; **18**, 2ff. Many MH stories show a similar beginning, cf. p. 87.

Such background information found at the beginning is often not present in the play itself.[16] This is one indication that the *hyp.* retells the play's myth but handles matters of the play's actual contents rather freely. The same observation holds true for the rest of the *hyp.*: the structure of the play with its prologue, parodos, episodes, choral odes, messenger speech, and so on is not at all reflected, nor is the order of events always strictly followed. The lengthy representation of the final scene often bears no relation to the preceding part of the *hyp.* This is usually a rapid summary of the play in which complete scenes are passed over in silence. As a consequence, some actors, such as Antigone in the *Ph.* and Teiresias in the *Ba.*, remain unrecorded.

A comparison of the *Ph.* with its *hyp.* will illustrate these features. The *hyp.* is preserved in papyri **15** and **16**, but I will print a mixture of the two *hypp.* below for purposes of illustration. Cf. Part Two for the precise text with less supplements.

'Ε]τ̣εοκλῆc π̣[αραλαβ]ὼ̣ν τὴν ἐν Θ̣ή[βαιc βαcιλείαν
τ]ὸ̣ν ἀδελφ[ὸν Πολυ]ν̣είκην ἀπ̣[εcτέρηcε τοῦ δι-
κ]α̣ί̣ου· φυγὰ[c δ' εἰc ῎Αρ]γοc παραγε[νόμενοc ἐκεῖ-
νο]c̣ ἔγημεν̣ [θυγατέ]ρ̣α τ̣[οῦ] β̣α̣c̣ι̣[λέωc 'Αδρά-
cτ]ου· κ[α]τε̣[λθεῖν δ' εἰc τὴν πατρίδα φιλοτιμού-
μ]ενο̣[c] κ̣[αὶ τὸν πενθερὸν πείcαc cτρατ ?
ονιδων cυ̣[νήθροιcεν ἐπὶ Θήβαc· ἡ δὲ μήτηρ αὐ-
τῶν ἔπειc̣ε̣[ν αὐτὸν ὑπόcπονδον εἰc τὴν πόλιν
π̣αραγενέcθα̣[ι. δεινοπροcωπήcαντοc δὲ ὑπὲρ
τ]ῆc̣ τυραννίδ[οc 'Ετεοκλέουc οὐκ ἠδύνατο τὰ
τέ]κνα cυναγα̣γ[εῖν εἰc φιλίαν· Πολυνείκηc δὲ
πα]ρ̣αταξόμεν[οc ἐχωρίcθη.
Τειρεc]ι̣[αc] δ̣[ὲ ἔχρηcε(ν) νικήcειν] το[ὺc ἐκ
τῆc πό]λ̣ε̣ωc [ἐὰν ὁ Κρέοντοc υἱὸc] Μεν[οι-
κεὺc cφ]άγιον̣ [῎Αρει γένηται. ὁ] μ̣[ὲν
οὖν νε]α̣ν̣ί̣c̣κ̣[οc ἑκουcίωc ἑαυτὸν

[16] Hamilton (1976: 68) gives the following examples of extra information in the med. *hypp.*: "Glauke's name (*Med.* hyp. 2), Iolaus' background and age (*Heracl.* 1-2), Theseus' earlier marriage and Hippolytus' beauty (*Hipp.* 1-5), the purpose of Alcestis' sacrifice (*Alc.* 2), Hera's role in the rescue of Helen (*Hel.* 9)." For papyri with additional information, cf. e.g. **8** *Hipp.* which agrees with the med. *hyp.*; **12** *Rh.* where the name Kalliope is given instead of Μοῦcα in the text of the tragedy itself. For other discrepancies between plays and *hypp.*, see Krenn (1971 passim) and Hamilton (1976: 68-69). The latter argues convincingly that one must be careful when using *hypp.* for the reconstruction of plays.

ἀπέcφ]α̣ξ̣ε̣[ν· Θηβαῖοι δὲ τοὺc ἡγεμό-
νας] τῶν Ἀρ̣[γείων †ἐcφαξαν̣†. Ἐτεοκλῆc
[δὲ καὶ Πολυνείκηc μονομαχήcαν-]
τεc ἀ̣[λλήλουc ἀνεῖλον. ἡ μὲν οὖν μήτηρ
αὐτ[ῶν] Ἰοκ[άcτη νεκροὺc εὑροῦcα τοὺc
παῖδας ἑαυτ[ὴν προ]cε[π]έcφ[αξ]εν, ὁ [δὲ
ταύτηc ἀδελ[φὸc] Κ̣ρέω̣ν̣ παρέλ[αβεν
τὴν β̣α̣c̣ιλείαν· [ο]ἱ δὲ Ἀρ̣[γ]ε̣ῖοι τ̣ῆ̣ι̣ μ̣ά̣χη[ι τ]ρ̣[ε-
φθέντεc ἀπε[χώρ]ηc̣[αν.] Κ̣[ρ]έω̣ν̣ δὲ παρ̣ρ̣η-
c̣ιαcτικώτερο̣[ν] τ̣ῆ̣ι̣ τ̣υ̣[χη]ι̣ χρ̣ώμενοc
τοὺc ὑπὸ τ̣ὴν Κ̣αδμείαν τῶν πο̣λεμίων
πεc̣[ό]ν̣τ̣[α]c̣ ε̣ἰc τ[α]φὴν οὐκ [ἔ]δωκεν· Πολ̣υ̣-
νείκην δ' ἀκ̣ήδ̣ε̣υτον ἔρει[ψε]ν̣· Οἰδίποδ[α
δὲ φυ̣γάδα τῆc̣ π[όλεωc] ἀ̣π̣έ̣cτειλε[ν
ἐφ' ὧν̣ [μὲν ο]ὐ̣ φυλάξ̣[αc τὸ]ν ἀνθρώπων̣ [νό-
μο]ν· [ἐφ' ὧν δὲ τὴν ὀργὴ]ν οὐ λοιπογρα̣[φή-
cαc [οὐδὲ ? παρὰ τὴν δυcτυχίαν ?
ἐλεήc[αc.

1-9a ≈ *Ph.* 74-83: Polyneices who was banished, returns with an army to Thebes and is persuaded by his mother to meet Eteocles in the city.
9b-12 ≈ *Ph.* 499-637: Eteocles refuses to yield his power and argues with Polyneices who leaves the city.
13-17a ≈ *Ph.* 834-1018: Teiresias announces that Thebes will be saved if Menoeceus is offered as a sacrifice. The latter kills himself.
17b-18 ≈ *Ph.* 1067-1263: the messenger tells Iocaste about Menoeceus' death and the battle between the two armies.
18 end-22 ≈ *Ph.* 1307-1459: the messenger tells Creon about the deaths of Polyneices, Eteocles and Iocaste.
From l. 22 ὁ δὲ onwards, the *hyp.* is not a straightforward retelling of the play: 24-25 οἱ δὲ Ἀργεῖοι - ἀπεχώρηcαν (≈ *Ph.* 1460-1479) should precede 22-24 ὁ δὲ - βαcιλείαν (≈ *Ph.* 1584-1588).
Instead of the moralistic 25 Κρέων - 34 (end), the lines 28-30 Πολυνείκην - ἀπέcτειλεν (≈ *Ph.* 1625-1634 and cf. 1589-1594 where Creon had already ordered Oedipus to go away) would have sufficed to summarize the end of the play. Brevity and accuracy have given away to rhetorical elaboration: 27-28 τοὺc ὑπὸ - οὐκ ἔδωκεν has no parallel in

the text of the *Ph.* where Creon forbids only the burial of Polyneices.[17]

It is obvious that many parts of the play are not represented: the larger part of the prologue (= 1-201), the parodos (202-260), the first part of the 1st episode, each stasimon (resp. 638-689, 784-833, 1019-1066, 1284-1306), the 2nd episode (690-783) and the scenes in which Antigone plays a role (88-201 = part of the prologue, 1264-1283 and 1639-1766) are passed over in silence.[18] It is further clear that the end of the *hyp.* is disproportionally long and that more attention has been paid to its form than to the contents.[19] Some endings of other *hypp.* are also carefully constructed (often with μέν-δέ),[20] though none is as elaborate as this one.

1.2.2 *Syntax and vocabulary*

The *hypp.* chiefly consist of single sentences, which are linked by the following particles: most times δέ, but also μὲν οὖν- and μέν-δέ,[21] καί, and explanative γάρ. Compound sentences occur far less and in some epitomes they are not present at all. Various types of subordinate clauses are found: e.g. relative, final, conditional, and obligatory clauses, that is clauses with the function object or subject, for instance with verbs of perception, emotion, saying or contriving. As often oc-

---

[17] This detail—Creon forbids the burial of the Argives—occurs in Apd. *Bibl.* 3, 7, 1 Κρέων δὲ τὴν Θηβαίων βαcιλείαν παραλαβὼν τοὺc τῶν Ἀργείων νεκροὺc ἔρριψεν ἀτάφουc. See also Hyg. *Fab.* 70 and 72. Krenn (1971) concludes that the discrepancies between plays and *hypp.* are not only caused by the succinctness and the style of the *hypp.*, but also by the influence of textual variants in the plays and by variant versions adopted from parallel stories.

[18] The omission of the choral songs is another indication that the mythical story is most important.

[19] Another *hyp.* which diverges considerably from the order of events in the play, is that of the *Troades*: first, Hecabe is not mentioned until the last sentence of the *hyp.*, although she is present throughout the play. Second, ll. 9-11 (cf. *OCT* Diggle p. 179) which tell us about Astyanax' death, Menelaus and Helen, and Agamemnon and Cassandra, do not reflect the chronological order in the play: Cassandra, not Agamemnon, appears first (308ff.); we twice hear about Astyanax (709ff. and 1118ff.) and inbetween is the scene with Menelaus and Helen (860ff.).

[20] Cf. *Andr.* **1b**, 50ff., *Or.* and *Sthen.* in **16** fr. 4, 2ff. and fr. 6a, 7ff. and *Rhad.* **12**, 28ff., *Tereus* **18**, 30ff.

[21] Cf. Diggle (1989: 1-11 = 1994: 327-340) on the balance of μέν-δέ phrases. This article further contains observations on αὐτόc, on ἐπι- and προcτάccω and on the order of the substantive plus dependent genitive, e.g. τὸν φόνον τῆc μητρόc.

curs in the post-classic period, a verb sometimes separates words that belong together.[22]

One of the most remarkable features of these *hypp.* is that the finite verbs of the independent sentences are mainly aorist and sometimes imperfect indicatives. These past tenses stand in sharp contrast to the present tense which is usually found in synopses.[23] The subordinate clauses comprise both present and past indicatives and present and aorist subjunctives. Optatives and imperatives are not attested in the papyri. The infinitive as an obligatory constituent occurs in most tenses and voices. In the following example the second sentence is also dependent on the verb of the first phrase: **16** fr. 6a, 6-9 *Sthen.* ... ὡμολόγ[η]cεν π[επραχέναι ταῦτα˙] δὶc γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθ[εὶc ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων] δίκην εἰληφένα[ι τὴν πρέπουcαν, τῆc] μὲν εἰc τὸ ζῆν, [τοῦ δὲ εἰc τὸ λυπεῖcθαι]. The articular infinitive, though less common, is also seen in several forms, cf. the example just quoted.

---

[22] Cf. **4**, 22-23 *Ba.*, **12**, 2 and 11-12 *Rh.*, **16** fr. 6a, 8 and **18**, 5-6. Regarding hyperbaton or the separation of words naturally belonging together, Palm (1955: 131ff.) writes that it occurs far more often in Hellenistic prose than before and that it is a simple but deliberate stylistic device. For the restricted use of particles and subordinate clauses in Hellenistic prose, see Palm (1955: 116ff.).

[23] The distinction made below between synopses and retellings, and the employment of different tenses in them, does not seem to be of much importance for conclusions about the actual use or function of certain texts (cf. n. 49 on **17** and p. 73), but it may help us to recognize their different natures. The word summary (and summarize) is used in a general sense encompassing both synopses and retellings, whereas these terms themselves indicate texts with the features mentioned below.

The present tense is usually found in synopses because their purpose is to attract attention to *what* is being summarized, not to *how* it is done. Hamburger (1973: 109 = 1968: 92) calls this present tense in synopses the "reproducing present" and defines it as an "a-temporal tense of statements about ideal objects". This reproducing or synoptic present (cf. Stanzel 1984: 23) is typical of synopses because they do not narrate, they refer to or relate contents, or to use Stanzel's terminology, "they report a story without mediacy, that is, directly". The presence of the past tense, on the other hand, accompanied by other narrative elements such as certain temporal adverbs, indicates that the text is a retelling. Stanzel (1984: 25-26) calls this a reduced grade of mediacy compared to the zero grade in synopses. A more or less comparable distinction was made by Weinrich (1964: esp. 47-50 and 291) who differentiated "die besprechenden und die erzählenden Tempora", which are in Greek resp. "Präsens, Perfekt, Futur I+II" and "Imperfekt, Aorist, Plusquamperfekt". Cf. also the extensive study on the present tense by Casparis (1975) and a paper on the historical present by Barri (1978: 43-56); see further Wisse (1996: 173-202) where a survey of theories on the citative and reproducing present precedes a case study on Philodemus' *On Rhetoric*.

An important feature of these *hypp.* is connected with the high number of participles:[24] most sentences are carefully constructed and they relate series of events, cf. e.g. **1b** *Alex.*, 25-30 *παραγενηθέντα δὲ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον Καc[cάν]δρ[α] μὲν ἐμμανὴc ἐπέγνω καὶ π[ερὶ τῶ]ν μελλόντων ἐθέcπιcεν, Ἑκάβη [δὲ ἀπο]κτεῖναι θέλουcα διεκωλύθη.*[25] Participles in all tenses and voices are often used instead of subordinate clauses or instead of proper names. Different usages can be discerned:

1. predicate participles

1.A. circumstantial participles (participium coniunctum), especially nominatives, are very numerous. Many of these participles are used in order to construct the chronological sequence of events. Other participles occur in descriptions or are explanatory.[26] When more than one nominative participle occurs, they are usually connected by conjunctions, e.g. *καί* or *μέν-δέ*.[27]

1.B. genitives absolutes occur frequently and they are also used instead of circumstantial participles, cf. **12**, **16** fr. 13, 3-5 and fr. 14.2, 12; and **18**.[28]

2. predicate participles as obligatory constituents: **16** fr. 2 *Mel.S.* ... *τὰ βρέφη ... θηλαζόμενα δὲ ὑπὸ μιᾶc τῶν βοῶν ἰδόντεc ...*

3. attributive participles are rare, e.g. **16** fr. 14.1 *Tennes ... τὴν δὲ ψευcαμένην γυναῖκα ἀπέκτεινεν.*

4. participles used substantively. The frequent usage is typical for these kind of *hypp.* Not only do we find wide spread instances as *τοὺc προειρημένουc*[29] and *τῶν μελλόντων*, but also rarer ones: e.g. *τὸν ἐκτεθέντα, ὁ θρέψαc, ὁ ταῦτα μηχανηcάμενοc* and *τὴν ... ἐφθαρμένην*.

The amount of substantives varies per *hyp.*; **16** fr. 2 *Mel.S.*, offers, compared to other *hypp.*, many expressions with nouns, which could

---

[24] For participles and their abundance in D.S., see Palm (1955: 117ff.).

[25] See also the text of *Mel.S.* cited on p. 12 (*ὑπὸ δὲ - προcήνεγκαν*); and e.g. **1b** *Andr.* 40 *οἱ δὲ* - 44 *ἐπιφανέντοc* and 50-56 (last sentence); **4** *Ba.* 31ff.; **8** *Hipp.* II 24 *cτέργουcα* - 28 *βοηθῆcειν*; **12** *Rh.* 3 *τούτοιc* - 8 *ψεν*, *Rhad.* 28-34 (last sentence) and *Scyrii* 38-43 *cτηι*; **16**, the endings of *Or.* (fr. 4), *Tennes* (fr. 14.1) and *Ph.* (fr. 17.4).

[26] For the position of predicate participles, and its importance for the interpretation of the text, cf. Sicking (1994: 11-17).

[27] For some examples of two nom. participles without conjunctions, see **10**, **12** and **18** and the med. *hypp.* to *Cycl.*, *IT* and *Me.*

[28] For this phenomenon, which occurs also in classical greek, see KG II, 2, 110-111; Palm (1955: 119-121). The *hypp.* of *Hec.*, *Heracl.* and *Rh.* transmitted in the med. mss. contain more examples.

[29] According to Palm (1955: 76), (*προ*)*ειρημένοc* is often used in Hellenistic prose instead of a demonstrative pronoun.

have been replaced by participles: *διὰ τὴν προcδοκίαν τῆc τοῦ πατρὸc παρουcίαc; κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ καταcπείραντοc; ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν κάθοδον τοῦ δυνάcτου*. In addition to verbs,[30] nouns, articles and conjunctions, the following parts of speech occur:

1. adjectives including comparatives and superlatives. Both the attributive and predicate adjectives, and those used as noun are not very numerous. They usually turn out to be not mere ornaments, but necessary constituents for the progress of the story. An example: **1b** *Alex. οἱ δ' ἄλλοι νομεῖc διὰ τὴν ὑπερήφανον cυμβίωcιν δήcαντεc ἐπὶ Πρίαμον ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν. ὑπερήφανον* explains the behaviour of the herdsmen.
2. adverbs of time, place and manner are used sparingly, some examples are: *πάλιν, ἤδη, ἐνταῦθα, ἐκεῖθεν, φαύλωc, ἀκουcίωc, παρρηcιαcτικώτερον*.
3. numerals also occur infrequently, cf. e.g. **1a**, 22; **1b**, 12-13; **16** fr. 6a, 7 and fr. 9, 8.
4. negations are usually employed in order to emphasize certain matters, cf. **16** fr. 17.4, 9, 12-13, where Creon's inhuman behaviour is stressed. There are also some rare examples of litotes, cf. **7**, 18 and **8**, 21.
5. prepositions are numerous. Cf. the text of **16** fr. 2 *Mel.S.* above and the usage in adverbial expressions, e.g. *μετὰ ἀνίαc* in **9**, 22; *ἐν τοῖc τόποιc* in **16** fr. 17.1, 3.[31]
6. pronouns. Both the pronoun *αὐτόc*, chiefly acting as the personal pronoun of third person, and the demonstratives *οὗτοc* and *ἐκεῖνοc*, as well as the article used as a demonstrative (*ὁ δέ/ἡ δέ/οἱ μέν ... οἱ δέ*), are often found. To a lesser degree, we also see reflexive (*ἑαυτοῦ*, etc.), relative (*ὅc, ὅcτιc*), correlative (*ἄλλοc, ἕκαcτοc*), interrogative (*τί*), indefinite (*τινεc*), and reciprocal (*ἀλλήλων*) pronouns. Personal pronouns (other than *αὐτοῦ* etc.) and possessive pronouns are lacking.

The vocabulary is composed of everyday terms flavoured by some unusual, technical, and poetical expressions.[32] A large part of the

---

[30] Instead of a verb. simplex in the tragedy, the *hyp.* often uses a compositum. Cf. Krenn (1971: 230-233).

[31] The extensive use of prepositions is very common in Hellenistic prose, cf. Palm (1955: 127) and Krenn (1971: 8 and 229-230).

[32] Cf. the following expressions: **16** fr. 14.5 *Phaethon γειτνιώcαc*, **15** *Ph. δεινοπροcωπήcαντοc*, **16** fr. 17.4 *Ph. παρρηcιαcτικώτερον*, **14** *Phrix. I κατηcφαλίcατο*, **16** fr. 17.3 *Phrix. II παρανάλωμα*, **16** fr. 17.4 *Ph. λοιπογραφήcαc*, **16** fr. 2 *Mel.S. βουγενῆ, βούcταcιc*, **16** fr. 14.3 *Phrix. I μητρυιᾶc πικρὸν βίον*.

wording is Hellenistic Greek.[33] As can be expected in texts based on tragedies, the following words are frequently used: those denoting relationships (παῖς, πατήρ, ἀδελφός, γυνή), death and plots (ἀναιρέω, ἀποκτείνω, ἐπιβουλεύω, θάνατος, μηχανάομαι, φονεύω, φόνος), verbs meaning persuade/command/wish (πείθω, κελεύω, ἐπι-/προστάσσω, (ἐ)θέλω), arrive/go away/appear (ἀπ-/κατ-/ἔρχομαι, χωρίζω, the participles παραγενόμενος/παραγενηθείς and ἐπιφανείς), and further γεννάω, γαμέω, (δια)κομίζω, κατοδύρομαι, λαμβάνω and μέλλω.

Krenn calls attention to various expressions, "Behelfsausdrücke", which have no parallel in the plays because they summarize or refer to persons/actions visible on stage: demonstrative pronouns, verba dicendi used instead of direct speech and κελεύω plus similar verbs used instead of imperatives, and so on. This phenomenon seems unavoidable in a retelling of a play: every action which is not an object of narrative in the play (e.g. in a messenger speech) is turned into an object of narrative instead of dramatic presentation in the *hyp.* or it is omitted.

Verbal repetitions are usually avoided. In *Hyps.* (16 fr. 14.2), Lycurgus' son is first referred to by τοῦ παῖδος and then by τὸ τέκνον. In the *Aeolus* (1a), Macareus is introduced by τούτων δ' ὁ νεώτατος Μακαρεὺς and is subsequently indicated as follows: ὁ δὲ νεανίσκος, ὁ ταῦτα μηχανησάμενος and τοῦτον. Instead of repeating the name of a god when he occurs for the second time, ὁ θεός is often used: *Phaethon* ἀπιστοῦντι δὲ ὡς ἐστιν Ἡλίου παῖς προσέταξεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τὰς ἱπποστασεις τοῦ θεοῦ ...[34] In general, personal names are replaced by pronouns (αὐτός and demonstrative, including the article used as a demonstrative), by other expressions denoting a profession or function (βασιλεύς, νομεύς, τροφός) or the relationship to other characters in the *hyp.* (μήτηρ, γυνή, etc.), or by participles used substantively, see the examples quoted on p. 9 and those below. This practice can be seen very clearly in 16 fr. 2, 7ff. *Mel.S.*: after Aeolus and Melanippe, his daughter, have been introduced in the first sentence, it is told that Aeolus, referred to by αὐτός, went into exile for a year and Melanip-

[33] Cf. the usage of particles, subordinate clauses, participles, prepositions, etc. discussed above and words like: 1a *Aeol.* and 16 frr. 48 + 125 *Ph.* νεανίσκος, 4 *Ba.* and 16 fr. 17.3 and fr. 17.4 *Ph.* (twice) παραλαμβάνω τὴν βασιλείαν, 1b *Alex.* κατηξίωσαν ὅπως, 1a *Aeol.* and 1b *Alex.* συμβίωσις, often παραγίνεσθαι with the meaning 'to arrive'. See further Krenn (1971), who discusses the wording of every med. *hyp.*

[34] Cf. *Andr.* and *Hipp.* This habit is quite common in other mythographical texts as well, see e.g. MH 56, 61-64, list 69, 38-44, and Apd. *Bibl.* 1, 9, 15.

pe became the mother of twin sons by Poseidon. Then Aeolus comes back: ἡ (=Melanippe) δὲ διὰ τὴν προcδοκίαν τῆc τοῦ πατρὸc παρουcίαc τοὺc γεννηθένταc εἰc τὴν βούcταcιν ἔδωκε τῆι τροφῶι θεῖναι κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ καταcπείραντοc. ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν κάθοδον τοῦ δυνάcτου τὰ βρέφη τινὲc τῶν βουκόλων φυλαττόμενα μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ταύρου, θηλαζόμενα δ' ὑπὸ μιᾶc τῶν βοῶν ἰδόντεc ὡc βουγενῆ τέρατα τῶι βαcιλεῖ προcήνεγκαν.[35] Apart from the reference to the children by τοὺc γεννηθένταc and τὰ βρέφη, and calling Poseidon τοῦ καταcπείραντοc, Aeolus is denoted by three different nouns, πατρὸc, δυνάcτου and βαcιλεῖ. πατρὸc corresponds with Melanippe's point of view—she expects her father's return, in other words, she is the focalizer—, δυνάcτου with that of the narrator or the cowherds and βαcιλεῖ with that of the cowherds.[36] These 'focalizing' nouns are represented in the other *hypp.* as well. Once persons have been introduced, double indications (e.g. Αἰόλου πατρόc instead of πατρὸc) are rare; the only instances are 16 fr. 17.3, 5-6 and 10, 3-4 twice if supplements are correct.

1.2.3 Conclusion

The preceding examination of contents, syntax and vocabulary leads to the conclusion that the narrative *hypp.* form a body of texts with specific characteristics. The presence of additional mythical information, the carefully constructed sentences, the rhetorical elaboration at the end, the consistent use of past tenses, the high frequency of participles, and esp. of participles used substantively, the minimum employment of adjectives and adverbs, and the avoidance of verbal repetitions all point to the hands of one specific author. Once the collection of *hypp.* had been composed, it was liable to changes as a consequence of repeated copying and various uses, as we will see in the next paragraphs.

1.3 Papyri

1a,b *P.Oxy.* 27, 2457 and 52, 3650

These two pieces stem from the same papyrus roll which has a tax-register assigned to the end of the first or very beginning of the

---

[35] This text is based on 16 fr. 2 and 10 supplemented with the med. text.

[36] For the terms focalizer and narrator, see De Jong (1987: 31ff.) and the explanation on 32-33: "We, the hearer/reader, are always confronted with a filtered view, i.e. selection and evaluation, of the events and this filtering is due to a focalizer ... this vision is put into words by a narrator."

second century AD on the front side and parts of four *hypp.* on the back. Papyrus **2457** seems to be of a finer quality than the thick **3650**, which means that a join must have come between the two fragments. The hand, which is assigned to the early second century AD, is a small, somewhat featureless one, made by a scribe writing in angular strokes with a fine pen. Its character is semi-documentary and its leading, height of letters and column width are irregular. Lines consist of twenty-eight to forty letters. There are no lectional signs or adscript iotas except for one in **1b**, 20. A paragraphus in **2457** marks the transition between two *hypp.* Titles and the words ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεϲιϲ are indented in both fragments.

2457 (**1a**) has parts of the *Alcestis* and *Aeolus* and **3650** (**1b**) of the *Alexandros* and *Andromache*. The *Alcestis hyp.* has some of the same phrases but is much longer than that preserved in the med. mss. The remains of the *hyp.* to *Andr.* seem to agree closely with the med. version apart from some small differences, cf. Luppe (1992 *ZPE*: 45-47). The only difficulty is caused by lines 57-65: in view of the med. *hyp.*, we expect the *Andr. hyp.* to end in l. 56 but the text continues without a sign of a new title and the words ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεϲιϲ. Coles (*ed. pr.*) presents three possible explanations: these lines consist of an unknown sequel, or they offer additional (didascalic?) material, which is nowhere else found in combination with this kind of *hypp.*, or they belong to a new *hyp.* without the expected layout. In view of the latter, Luppe (1991: 83) suggests the *Alope* and points out that ll. 57-58 could belong to the citation of the first line.

2 *P.Köln* 1, 1

This piece holds part of a *hyp.* to the *Auge* written on the back of a document in a regular round hand assigned to the second century AD. Title and ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ are indented and perhaps the citation as well.[37] There are no lectional signs, and only one intrusive iota adscript appears. Lines were presumably about thirty-five letters long.

[37] Koenen's supplements (cf. *ed. pr.*) are based on the assumption that the complete heading is indented. Luppe (1983 *APF*: 19-23) offers alternative supplements in the supposition that such an indentation is not probable. However, 4, assigned like this pap. to the second century, shows that Koenen's layout is possible.

3 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 19766 (= *MPER* N.S. 3, 32)

This text is written on the back of a document which is assigned to the end of the first or the first half of the second century AD, in an irregular, clumsy, informal round, bilinear hand assigned to the second part of the second century AD. This 'alphabetic' hand points to the work of a pupil (cf. Cribiore 1996: no. 192).

The first two lines are not identified and 3-5 contain a saying of Diogenes followed by the words *τὸ δρᾶμα* Ε̣ὐ̣[ρ]ι̣π(ίδου) and the title of the play, the first *Autolycus*, written in a smaller hand. The last two lines seem to preserve the beginning of a summary or *hyp.* although the citation of the first line and the words *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ* are not present. This text clearly does not form part of the usual collection of *hypp.* though it may go back to one. Diogenes' saying and the part on Autolycus might have been put together in view of the theme 'greed' or 'the greedy'.

4 *P.Oxy.* 60, 4017

P.Oxy. 4017 consists of twenty-seven papyrus fragments written in a sometimes backward sloping semi-cursive assigned to the second half of the second century AD. The text of the *hypp.* is written on the back of quotations from the *Il.* and *Od.* written out as prose. There are no punctuation or lectional signs apart from a high stop (20). The scribe has sometimes indicated word breaks by a wider space between letters. There are several errors and ca. twenty-seven to thirty letters per line. The entire heading is indented.

The fragments contain parts of the *hypp.* to the *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Bellerophon* and other unidentified plays. The *hyp.* to the *Ba.* is close to the med. text, apart from ll. 27 Κάδμοϲ - 30 which do not seem to be present in that text.

5 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3651

This narrow strip of papyrus presents an upright, informal hand of the mixed type, attractively and competently written. It is attributed to the late second or early third century AD. There are two corrections and two lectional signs, a diaeresis over an iota and an apostrophe. A space twice indicates a pause. Lines are ca. thirty letters long. The back is blank.

The text presents the latter part of the *hyp.* to *Bellerophon* and the heading indented as usual and the first part of the *hyp.* to the *Busiris.*

6 *P.Oxy.* 3, 420

The back of this papyrus has been used for writing an account in a cursive hand of the late third century whereas the writing on the front—a regular upright hand of the mixed type, similar to that of 5—is assigned to the middle of the third century AD. There are no errors and no lectional signs except for one apostrophe. Lines contain ca. twenty-five letters.

This text retells ll. 357-584 of the *Electra*. The first part of the papyrus text is lost, so that we do not know whether it belongs to the common collection of *hypp.* or not. In contrast with the usual economy found in the middle of a *hyp.*,[38] it contains many words and clauses that reflect phrases in the tragedy but could be left out without obscuring the meaning: 2-3 πενιχρῶν μέν, ἀλλὰ [φι]λοτίμων; 4 τῇ cπουδῇ; 6 ὁ πρεcβύτηc; 8-9 ἃ τοῖc κατ' ἀγρὸν ... δωρεῖται; 13-14 οὐκ ... ἀ]λλ'.

Luppe (1981: 181-187) stresses the resemblances to the other *hypp.* in vocabulary more than the unparalleled wording cited. He admits that the antithetical expressions in ll. 2-3 and 13-14 are remarkable but the even more conspicuous descriptive relative clause in ll. 8-9 is not mentioned by him. However, the text, in this form, seems to present a rhetorically elaborated *hyp.*[39] rather than one that is still part of the traditional collection of *hypp.*

7 *P.Mich.* inv. 6222A

This papyrus consists of a number of small dark brown fragments, varying in width from 5-10 cm, that assumed the appearance of having been used for book cartonnage, as the first editor judges from the unusual thickness. The text is written in a mixed style hand with a slant to the right and it has been assigned to the late second or beginning of the third century AD. There are several corrections and some twenty-nine to thirty letters per line. Lectional signs do not appear. The back is blank.

---

[38] The endings of some *hypp.* are rhetorically embellished, cf. p. 7.

[39] This has first been remarked by Zuntz (1955: 141 n. 5): "*Pap.* Ox. 420 shows the argument of Euripides' *Electra* used as a subject for a rhetorical exercise." Comparable antithetic phrases occur in a rhetorical paraphrase of *Il.* 1: *Bodl.Gr.Inscr.* 3019, 10-12 μαντίαc ταῦτα οὐ δεῖται ... ἀλλ'; 21-22 ... ἐξ οὐδενὸc ἄλλου ἔφυ ἢ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοc; 38-40 ... οὐδὲν ἄλλο ... ἢ τὸ πορθῆcαι; 48 ... οὐ προῖκα οὐδὲ δωρεᾶι, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ λύτροιc παμπόλοῖc καὶ ...

These papyrus fragments are concerned with the history of Hippolytus and Phaedra. Although the traditional heading has not been preserved, several arguments point to a *hyp.* or retelling based on *Hippolytus* I. First, this text has nothing in common with the *hyp.* to *Hipp.* II (cf. 8 and med. codd.). Second, several words are not compatible with *Hipp.* II: 7 θεττaλι[, 29 'Ιπ]πολύτου cτολὴν and perhaps 31 *κα]λυψάμενον*.

The order of the fragments and the reconstruction of the play provided by Luppe, who published the papyrus, need revision: an overlap with an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus (see p. 22) demonstrates that Luppe's fr. C should precede fr. B. The new papyrus provides us with the beginnings of eighteen lines, which is however not enough to form a complete picture of the course of events.

8 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 2, 44

This narrow strip of papyrus contains the end of one and the beginning of another column. The remains of the *hypp.* are written on the back of a document in an inexperienced, upright round hand assigned to the end of the first century AD. The line endings and beginnings and the leading are rather irregular. This papyrus may be a school text.[40] There are no lectional signs and one line has been deleted. About twenty-five letters are written per line.

The first three lines are presumably occupied with the end of one *hyp.* A *hyp.* to *Hippolytus* II seems to start in line 4 without the usual layout: the heading is not distinguished from the *hyp.* The scanty remains of our *hyp.* seem to agree with the med. *hyp.* to *Hipp.* II, apart from some differences in wording and word order; for a comparison, cf. Luppe (1983 *Phil.*: 155-162).

9 *P.IFAO inv. P.S.P.* 248

This papyrus fragment has been wiped out after previous usage and now has text on one side written in an upright informal hand with ligatures attributed to the first half of the second century AD. Lectional signs do not appear. Adscript iota is written twice and there is one correction.

[40] R. Cribiore, who wrote a book on school texts (cf. Cribiore 1996) kindly inspected the plate of this papyrus and confirmed this possibility.

The text preserves a substantial part of a *Medea hyp.* introduced by the title (indented) and citation of the first line and perhaps ἡ δ' ὑπόθεcιc. The title is preceded by a B̄ which points presumably to an order based on the contents of the *hypp.* The first two lines probably stem from a *Peliades hyp.* The *hyp.* to the *Medea* is considerably longer than the med. one. It has only a few phrases in common, see Luppe (1986: 37-58).

10 *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 25, 2

Number 10 is a tiny fragment with parts of five lines of writing against the fibres preceded by an upper margin of nearly 3.6 cm. The text is written in an upright capital assigned to the late first or early second century AD. The other side has a documentary text written along the fibres. Adscript iotas or lectional signs do not appear. Lines are ca. thirty-eight letters long.

What is left of this *hyp.* to the *Melanippe Sophe* agrees to a great extent with the med. version (cf. Nauck 509 and Collard-Cropp-Lee 1995: 248), which text contains two nominative participles (πειcθεὶc - κρίναc) without the expected conjunction before the finite verb (cf. p. 9).

11 *P.Amst.* 1, 7

On the back of a documentary list of twenty-five names are the remnants of two columns written against the fibres in a largish literary hand with cursive features that does not reflect great skill, though it is not that of a schoolboy. The hand is attributed to the early third century AD. There is one itacism. Adscript iotas do not appear.

The remains of the first column are not identified and the second is concerned with the Peliades and the rejuvenation cure of Pelias. This text is too fragmentary to establish whether it is part of a *hyp.* of the *Peliades* or of a story in a mythographical handbook.[41]

12 *PSI* 12, 1286

PSI 1286 contains parts of three *hypp.* written in a regular round upright bilinear hand attributed to the end of the second century AD.

---

[41] In the second edition (*P.Amst.* 1, 7; 1980) the editors title this papyrus "Diegese zu Euripides' Peliaden(?)", whereas Sijpesteijn is more careful in his first edition (1972: 108): "I dare not make a choice between a *hyp.* and a fragment of a mythological handbook."

Play-title and the words ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ are indented whereas the citation and the first line of the *hypp.* are written in ekthesis. Some high stops and adscript iotas occur. There are several errors and lines consist of about twenty-six letters.

The *Rhesus hyp.* is to a large degree similar to the med. *hyp.* which has several erroneous readings.[42] Whereas the text of the tragedy only employs Μοῦϲα to indicate Rhesus' mother, our papyrus provides the name Καλλιόπη.[43] The second column preserves the end of a *hyp.* to the *Rhadamanthys* and the beginning of one to the *Scyrii.* The syntax of these *hypp.* displays some notable features: the following sentence from *Rh.* 12-17 παραγενηθέ[ντοϲ] δὲ Ἕκτοροϲ [ἵ]να αὐτόπτηϲ τ[ῶν] πεπραγμέ[ν]ων γένηται, τετ[ρ]ωμένοϲ ὁ τῶ[ν Ῥή]ϲου πώλων ἐ[πιμ]ελητὴϲ διὰ τ[οῦ Ἕκ]τοροϲ τὸν φ[όνο]ν ἐνηργῆϲθα[ι ἐ]πινοεῖ, with the combination of a gen. abs. plus dependent clause followed by a predicate participle in the nominative plus subject and the present indicative ἐπινοεῖ (cf. crit. app. on l. 17), is without parallel. In the *Rhad.* one may expect (in view of 30-31 Ἄρτεμιϲ ἐπιφανεῖϲα προϲέταξε) Ῥαδαμάνθυι plus dat. participles instead of the present gen. abs. (28ff.).[44] In the *Scyrii,* we find a gen. abs. instead of a circumstantial participle in the nom. (38ff.) followed by two nom. participles without conjunctions before the finite verb (if the supplement κρύψαϲα is correct).[45]

13 *P.Mich.* inv. 1319 (*Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 17, 18)

This papyrus is written on both sides by three different hands: the hand on the recto is of a fair size, angular and slanting slightly to the right. It is not very skilful, as is shown by the different sizes of its letters and by the irregularity of the spacing and alignment. The text is written in two narrow columns (the first column contains between

---

[42] Cf. Luppe (1982: 74-82).

[43] For the addition of extra information in the *hypp.*, cf. n. 16. Apd. 1, 3, 4 also mentions Calliope (and Euterpe) as mother of Rhesus. Sch. *Il.* 10, 435 and sch. E. *Rh.* 246 enumerate other mothers. For fluctuations in the nomenclature of mythical figures, see Henrichs (1987: 248-254) and Bremmer (1987: 45 + n. 18).

[44] The same construction with dative participles at the beginning of sentences occurs in **1b**, 50ff. and **16** fr. 14.5, 4-7. Slings, on the other hand, argues in a paper on Platonic anacolutha that sentences do not usually start with datives (connected with circumstantial participles) unless the function of the dative is obvious at first sight, cf. Slings (1996: esp. 430-432 and 436-437).

[45] For the use of participles and conjunctions, cf. p. 9.

fourteen and twenty letters per line, the second column between nine and fifteen) with several phonetic errors (e.g. *δαιτωτον* instead of *δε το των*). The same text is written across the fibres on the other side of the papyrus in a different hand, which is more tentative and which makes more errors and omissions. There are ca. twenty-eight letters per line. This hand writes the title of this exercise, *διηγήματα*,[46] in the middle of the space on the left. A third hand, an 'alphabetic' hand like the second (cf. Cribiore 1996: no. 301), has written the same title some seven lines above the other title. These school hands might be assigned to the third or fourth century AD.

The narrative seems to go back to a *hyp.* of the *Temenidae* because it displays a remarkable overlap with fr. 107 of **16**.[47] In addition to this overlap, Luppe (1978: 6 n. 3) points to the occurrence of *μέν-δέ*, participles and other similar expressions. But there is a difference as well: the repetition of words does not agree with the usual style, cf. 3 *⟨ἀν⟩αβιβαcάμενοι* - 4-5 *διεβίβαcαν* and 8 *τὴν μάχην* - 9 *τῆc μάχηc*.

14 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3652

The text is written in a rather small capital, sloping to the right, assigned to early third century AD. *Pace* Cockle (*ed. pr.*), the back is not blank: the upper part contains fourteen lines of unidentified writing in a semi-cursive hand different from that on the front. There are no lectional signs except two diaereses and an acute accent. A space twice indicates a pause. A second hand has made a deletion and added corrections in the intercolumnium opposite l. 19ff. There is a lower margin of 3.4 cm. The title is indented and the words *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεcιc* are presumably absent, though they may have been written in small letters at the end of l. 17.

The papyrus preserves the end of a *hyp.* to the *Hypsipyle* and the beginning of that to *Phrixus* I. There is no overlap between this *Hyps. hyp.* and the fragments of the one in **16** (fr. 14.1 - fr. 14.3) whereas that to *Phrixus* coincides with **16** fr. 14.3, 4ff. apart from some minor discrepancies.

---

[46] The term *διήγημα* is often used in a rhetorical context to indicate one of the *progymnasmata*, cf. Theon *RhG* II 78, 15ff. ed. Spengel *Διήγημά ἐcτι λόγοc ἐκθετικὸc πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡc γεγονότων*. The latin term is *narratio*, cf. Cic. *inv.* 1, 27. For more information on *διήγημα* and *διήγηcιc*, see Montefusco (1988: 33ff., esp. 33-35). Libanius provides many examples of *διηγήματα*, cf. ed. Foerster (1915).

[47] This overlap was discovered by Harder (1979: 7-14).

15 *P.Oxy.* 31, 2544

P.Oxy. 2544 consists of two fragments from a papyrus of fair quality written across the fibres in a bold, upright, informal hand, with some ligatures, attributed to the late second or early third century AD. The other side is blank. There are no lectional signs or adscript iotas. Lines are between thirty and thirty-seven letters long.

The remains of this *hyp.* to the *Phoenissae* agree for the greater part with the Byzantine version of Moschopoulos and with the one partly preserved in **16** fr. 17.3, 14ff.; for an extensive comparison, see Barrett 1965: 58-71. The first editors think that this text does not derive directly from a *hypp.* collection. The absence of the usual three-lined heading at the top of the *hyp.*, the informality of the hand and the fact that the writing is across the fibres inclines them to the view that this text stood by itself and could have been made for the purposes of the schoolroom.

16 *P.Oxy.* 27, 2455

Many fragments have survived of a papyrus roll of excellent quality with text written in a practised, attractive medium-sized, squarish capital, which gives the impression of informality in spite of its regularity of execution. Some letters form ligatures and serifs finish a number of uprights. The hand is assigned to the early second century AD. There is one trace of re-use: on the verso of fr. 8 appears a fraction followed by the totalling formula. The scribe writes ca. thirty letters per line, he uses diaereses and high stops, both with the force of a comma and a full point. *ν* at the end of the line is indicated by a dash above and beyond the last letter. There are several corrections and itacisms and many intrusive iotas adscript though they are rarely used in the dative.

This papyrus has been the subject of innumerable articles for it contains parts of *hypp.* to plays with initials from M to X:[48] *Medea, Melanippe Sophe, Oedipus, Orestes, Peliades, Sciron, Stheneboea, Syleus, Telephus, Temenidae, Temenus, Tennes, Troades, Hypsipyle, Phaëthon, Philoctetes, Phoenissae, Phoenix, Phrixus I + II, Chrysippus,* and more unidentified fragments. Five *hypp.* can be compared with med. versions: *Melanippe Sophe, Orestes, Stheneboea, Troades* and *Phoenissae.* The latter coincides more with the Byzantine version of Moschopoulos

[48] Bibliographical notes are printed at the top of the fragments in Part Two.

and **15** than with the med. text (see **15**) and the other four show only small differences in wording and word order.

17 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3653

This papyrus contains parts of some *hypp.* to tragedies of Sophocles written on the back of a document. The hand is a not particularly well-executed semi-cursive which shows considerable variety in size, spacing and forms of the letters. It has been assigned to the middle of the second century AD. There are no lectional signs apart from some diaereses and a forked paragraphus. A second hand has made corrections in l. 37. Lines are about forty letters long.

These two fragments preserve the end of a *hyp.* to Sophocles' *Nauplius Catapleon* and parts of that to the *Niobe* and traces of two more unidentified *hypp.* Whereas the *Niobe* seems to share the usual characteristics, the fragmentary *hyp.* to *Nauplius* contains present indicatives instead of indicatives of past tense.[49] The heading to the *Niobe* is written on two lines, of which the first is remarkable for two reasons. First, ἀρ[χὴ] is followed by the demonstrative pronoun ἥδε, and second, instead of *οὗ* ἀρ[χὴ], one expects ἧc ἀρ[χὴ], if Νιόβη is a correct supplement. Cockle (*ed. pr.* 36) convincingly suggests that Νιόβη is treated as equalling *τὸ δρᾶμα*.[50] Other possibilities are (i) the title is not Νιόβη, (ii) the title is Νιόβη but the writer erroneously wrote *οὗ* in view of other masculine titles.

18 *P.Oxy.* 42, 3013

On the back of a register, across the fibres, is a story about *Tereus*, written in a decent semi-cursive of the second or third century AD. No lectional signs appear except for an apostrophe. There are some errors including one intrusive iota adscript. Two iota adscripts are written correctly. Lines contain ca. twenty-three letters. The left margin of 5 cm probably means that we have the beginning of the roll or sheet. The narrative ends with the second column; there is no means

[49] These *hypp.* show that there is no point in postulating a different usage or function for a given text solely on the basis of the different use of tenses. It seems as if little importance was attached in this collection of *hypp.* to the consistent use of past or present tenses. This feature may point to an origin for the text different from that of the main collection (cf. p. 24), or to changes that have been made in the course of transmission.

[50] *τὸ δρᾶμα* also occurs in **3**, but in a different phrasing.

of telling whether there were further columns treating further stories. Instead of the usual three-lined heading, this story is preceded by Τηρεύϲ· [ἡ (δ') ὑ]πόθεϲιϲ set out in the upper margin. This seems to speak against the possibility that the present text formed part of a larger collection of *hypp.*

Although the heading proves no connection with a particular play, the contents suggest a *hyp.* to Sophocles' *Tereus*. The syntax preserves some notable features: a genitive absolute is twice used instead of a circumstantial participle or subordinate clause,[51] cf. 8-12 *χρόνου δὲ διελθόντοϲ καὶ βουλομένηϲ τῆϲ Πρόκνηϲ θεάϲαϲθαι τὴν ἀδελφήν, ἠξίωϲε τὸν Τηρέα πορεύϲαϲθαι εἰϲ Ἀθήναϲ ἄξειν·*—*ἄξειν* is also strange—and 20-23. And in 24-26 two nominative participles, *ἐπιγνοῦϲα* and *οἰϲτρηθεῖϲα*, both seem to precede the finite verb without the expected conjunction (cf. p. 9).

There are as far as I know two more unpublished papyri with *hypp.* or texts closely related to them:

* The first papyrus assignable to the second or third century AD was discovered during excavations in Karanis. It preserves parts of *hypp.* of Euripides' *Palamedes, Stheneboea*, *Phrixus*, and others. Part of the papyrus is in Ann Arbor (Mi.), part of it in Cairo, as I was kindly informed by T. Gagos in September 1996.

* The second is an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus which I examined during a stay in Oxford. It probably contains parts of two *hypp.*: the first column on Theseus, Ariadne and Minos seems to be the end of a *hyp.* to E. *Theseus*, and the second column shows an overlap with the text of 7, a *hyp.* to E. *Hipp.* I. This papyrus will be published in one of the future Oxyrhynchus volumes.

*1.4 Comparative survey of papyri **1-18***

Since the contents of the papyri have already been discussed in 1.1 and 1.2, this survey deals with provenance, date, hands, format, and so forth. Half of the eighteen papyri are found in Oxyrhynchus (**1**, **4-6**, **15-18**) and the provenance of the other half is unknown. All papyri are assigned to the first four centuries AD, most of them to the second (**1-4**, **9**, **12**, **16**, **17**). Many *hypp.* are written on the back of previ-

---

[51] For this phenomenon, see p. 9 n. 28.

ously used papyri (1-4, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18) or are reused themselves (6, 14); the back of 5, 7, 9 (this papyrus has been wiped out after previous usage), 12 and 16, except for one trace, and the front of 15—the *hyp.* is written across the fibres—is blank. The school text (13) has *hypp.* on both sides.

The hands vary from inexperienced school hands (3 and 13 and perhaps 8), to irregular and regular practised hands. Some of them have many cursive features, cf. esp. 1, 4, 14, 17, 18; of which 1 and 17 are irregular. The hands that show the greatest formality are written along the fibres, see 5-7 and 12.

Lectional signs are not preserved in most papyri, but one or more high stops occur in 4, 12 and 16; apostrophe appears in 5, 6, and 18; diaeresis occurs in 5, 14, 16 and 17; and 14 has one accent. Paragraphi appear in 1, 16 and 17. There are no line-fillers. 3 abbreviates the name Euripides. Many papyri contain itacistic writings and/or other small errors, though some of them have been corrected, cf. 2, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16-18.

The majority of the narrative *hypp.* (4-8, 12, 16, 18 and probably 3) have twenty to thirty letters per line; 1, 2, 14 and 15 have thirty-one to thirty-five letters per line; 10, 17 and perhaps 9 have ca. thirty-eight to forty letters per line. The school text 13 has two columns with less than twenty letters per line and one column with about twenty-eight letters per line (resp. ca. 8, 5.5 and 8.5 cm); and the format of 11 is uncertain. The estimated or measured column width of the majority (1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18) is between 7 and 9.5 cm; 3, 4 and 17 are probably broader.

Most papyri that preserve a heading (1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16-18) have the same format: the heading consists of three lines of which the first with title + *οῦ/ῆϲ/ὼν ἀρχή* and third with *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ* are indented. The *incipit* that starts at the beginning of line two may either end on this line or run over to the third where it is indented. Main aberrations from this format appear in 8, 9, 14, 17 and 18. The text of 8 is uncertain, but the heading seems to have been written continuously without indentation; the third line is lacking in 14 and perhaps in 9; in 17, the words *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ* follow the *incipit* on the second line and 18 only has the title followed by *ἡ ὑπόθεϲιϲ* on one line.

Seven papyrus texts (1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 16 and 17) are certainly transmitted in alphabetically ordered collections of *hypp.*, four (2, 7, 8, 10) perhaps—nothing speaks against this—; the two school texts 3 and 13 certainly not; 6, 15 and 18 probably not, though they may have been based on the usual collection, cf. commentary; 9 preserves parts of

two *hypp.* (*Peliades* - *Medea*) but they seem to follow a thematic order; and the status of **11** is uncertain: it may be a mythographical story instead of a *hyp.*

When we combine this information with the provenance of the papyri, it appears that six of the seven papyri which form certainly part of an alphabetical collection stem from Oxyrhynchus; the provenance of **12** is unknown. The remaining Oxyrhynchus papyri (**6**, **15**, **18**) are probably transmitted separately though they seem to go back to the usual collection. This outcome may be due to the chances of survival: if **2**, **7**, **8**, **10** and **11** had preserved more text, they might have had more than one *hyp.* in alphabetical order.

The seven papyri that are transmitted in the usual collection are not more uniform in their physical aspects than the other papyri: the back of three papyri are blank (**5**, **12**, **16**) and four (**1**, **4**, **14**, **17**) are written on the back of previously used papyri or are reused again.

In short, the *hypp.* are written in hands of various typology, size, formality, and date on various kinds of papyrus, but their style is quite uniform (when compared, for example, to the corpus of Homeric *hypp.*, cf. p. 53ff.) apart from some minor grammatical divergences in **10**, **12**, **17**, and **18**, the high number of repetitions in the school text **13**, and the rhetorical embellishment of **6**.

1.5 Origin and transmission

We have seen in the preceding sections that most narrative *hypp.* display the same characteristics although their provenances and dates are not the same. This suggests that these *hypp.* stem from one single collection[52] which was copied and read by people living in different areas and times. The discrepancies mentioned may have originated in the process of transmission: especially if the collection of *hypp.* was not copied in its entirety, the precise contents (cf. **6** and **13**) or order (cf. **9**) of the *hypp.* singled out would more easily have been subjected to changes. It is of course also possible that some of the divergent *hypp.* are original products of other authors composed in a roughly similar style.

In addition to the papyri, several narrative *hypp.* have been transmitted through the teaching of rhetoric: *hypp.* to Euripides' *Melanippe Sophe* and *Stheneboea* and to Critias' *Pirithous* are found in the commentaries of both Johannes Logothetes and Gregorius Cor. (twelfth

[52] On the question of authorship, cf. p. 2f.

century) on Hermogenes' Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος.[53] The *hypp.* to *Mel.S.* and *Sthen.* correspond closely with the papyrus texts (cf. **10**, **16** fr. 2 and 5-6a) although their context is different. Med. codd.[54] also preserve individual *hypp.* prefixed to the text of the plays, where they presumably serve as a kind of introduction. Most *hypp.* which are transmitted both on papyrus and in med. mss. agree substantially, apart from differences in wording or word order, cf. the *hypp.* of *Andr.*, *Ba.*, *Hipp.* II, *Or.*, *Rh.*, *Tr.*, and *Ph.*[55] An exception is the med. version of the *Med.*, which is considerably shorter than the papyrus text (cf. **9**), and the same seems to hold true for the med. *hyp.* of *Alc.* (cf. **1a**). It is not known whether these two med. *hypp.* originate from the main ancient collection and have been abridged, or whether they are part of a different type of *hypp.* Nor do we know when precisely editions of plays with *hypp.* came into being and how long the collection of narrative *hypp.* was transmitted in its entirety.[56]

1.6 Connection with Ps.-Apollodorus and Ps.-Hyginus

Before the part on the narrative *hypp.* is concluded with suggestions on function and readership, this section briefly introduces Apd. *Bibl.* and

---

[53] Cf. for Joh. Log., ed. Rabe, *Rh. M.* 63, 1908, 144-147; for Greg. Cor., ed. Walz *Rhet. Gr.* VII, 2 p. 1312 and Nauck (1964: 509 and 567-568); on *Pirithous*, cf. *TrGF* 1 43 F 1. In addition to these *hypp.*, the Latin text of Moses Chorenensis *Progymn.* lib. III contains passages which seem to go back to summaries of E. *Auge* and *Peliades*, printed in Nauck (1964: 436-437 and 550-551). For more summaries in commentaries and scholia, cf. Nauck (1964: 563) = *Protesilaus* in sch. Arist.; Nauck (1964: 575) = *Syleus* from Tzetzes' treatise on comedy. On Tzetzes' and Logothetes' summaries of Euripidean plots, cf. Sutton (1988: 87-92) who coins the existence of a set of Euripidean *hypp.* accompanied by quotations. See further *hyp. Alcestis* in sch. Pl. *Smp.* 179B.

[54] The oldest codex with a *hyp.*, B (Parisinus gr. 2713) is dated to the end of the tenth or to the eleventh century, cf. *Ph.* ed. OCT Diggle (1994: 72).

[55] The version of the *Ph.-hyp.* in the med. mss. MBAV agrees to a large degree with the pap. texts, but Barrett (1965: 58ff.) demonstrates that Moschopoulos made use of a version even closer to the pap. texts **15** and **16** fr. 17.3-4 and superior to the med. version. As far as the *hyp.* of *Or.* is concerned, Moschopoulos' text resembles the text in the other med. mss. more closely than **16** fr. 3-4.

[56] Cf. Barrett (1965: 63) on the transmission of the *Ph.-hyp.*: "Any attempt to date the various stages in the transmission can only be speculative. We do not know when it became customary to prefix an epitome to a tragic text; I would myself surmise that it happened in late antiquity (say the sixth century), at the time when it became customary to fill the margins of the codex with the copious extracts from commentaries that became the basis of the medieval scholia."

Hyg. *Fab.* and examines the agreements between these writings and the narrative *hypp.*, to which many scholars have pointed, see below.[57]

The first author is called Ps.-Apollodorus to distinguish him from the grammarian Apollodorus of Athens (±180-110 BC), to whom Photius and the mss. have wrongly ascribed the *Bibl.* The *Bibl.* was probably written somewhere between the first century BC and the third century AD.[58] This book is a prose summary of Greek myths and heroic legends with a genealogical, and within the families, chronological arrangement: the narrative first tells about the oldest family, the gods, then about the younger families of Deucalion, Inachus, Agenor, and so on. Lists or catalogues are incorporated into the narrative. The greater part of the *Bibl.* has been transmitted to us in several mss. which are all copies of a ms. that ends in the middle of Theseus' adventures (3, 16, 2). In 1891, two epitomes were separately published which also include the end of the *Bibl.*[59]

As indicated above, many scholars have pointed to agreements between Apd. and the *hypp.* of the Euripidean tragedies.[60] A comparison of the *hypp.* transmitted on papyrus with Apd. shows that they often deal with the same subjects but that large similarities do not occur. The *hypp.* are usually more extensive so that agreements are restricted to one or two comparable sentences: cf. *Scyrii* ll. 38ff. of 12 with *Bibl.* 3, 13, 8 *Ὡϲ δὲ ἐγένετο ἐνναετὴϲ Ἀχιλλεύϲ, Κάλχαντοϲ λέγοντοϲ οὐ δύναϲθαι χωρὶϲ αὐτοῦ Τροίαν αἱρεθῆναι, Θέτιϲ προειδυῖα ὅτι δεῖ ϲτρατευόμενον αὐτὸν ἀπολέϲθαι, κρύψαϲα ἐϲθῆτι γυναικείαι ὡϲ παρθένον Λυκομήδει παρέθετο. κἀκεῖ τρεφόμενοϲ τῆι Λυκομήδουϲ θυγατρὶ Δηιδαμείαι μίγνυται, καὶ γίνεται παῖϲ Πύρροϲ αὐτῶι ὁ κληθεὶϲ Νεοπτόλεμοϲ αὖθιϲ. Ὀδυϲϲεὺϲ δὲ μηνυθέντα παρὰ Λυκομήδει ζητῶν Ἀχιλλέα, ϲάλπιγγι χρηϲάμενοϲ εὗρε.* It appears that there are both ver-

---

[57] A more detailed discussion of these writings is given in App. One. See also p. 70ff. and p. 106ff. for the link between the *Bibl.* and Homeric *hypp.* and MH, and p. 151ff. for Hyg. and the mythical catalogues.

[58] Cf. the survey of opinions in Carrière/Massonie (1991: 9-12); they are inclined to date the work between 180 and 230 AD whereas Robert (1873: 38-41) among others suggests the second century AD.

[59] For the epitomes, cf. Wagner (1891) and Papadopulos-Kerameus (1891), and for the ms. tradition in general, cf. Wagner (1894); Diller (1935) and Papathomopoulos (1973). The text of Apd. is quoted from the edition of Wagner (1894). Important studies are Robert (1873), Wagner (1891) and those mentioned in n. 66.

[60] Cf. Huys (1997 *RhM*) who enumerates both the scholars who pointed to agreements (n. 32) and the passages from Apd. which may be related to or have been connected with Euripidean *hypp.*

bal agreements and differences. Besides, the birth of Pyrrhus does not seem to be related in the *hyp.* and it is doubtful whether the end of the *hyp.* would have corresponded with the *Bibl.*[61]

The same inference may be drawn for the *hypp.* transmitted in the med. mss.; the correspondences are restricted to small verbal agreements with Apd., of which the most noteworthy are: *Alcestis* Ἀπόλλων ᾐτήσατο παρὰ τῶν Μοιρῶν ὅπως Ἄδμητος τελευτᾶν μέλλων παράσχῃ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἑκόντα τεθνηξόμενον[62]—with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 15 Ἀπόλλων δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὴν θεόν, ᾐτήσατο παρὰ μοιρῶν ἵνα, ὅταν Ἄδμητος μέλλῃ τελευτᾶν, ἀπολυθῇ τοῦ θανάτου, ἂν ἑκουσίως τις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θνήσκειν ἕληται; *Phoenissae* ἔχρησε δὲ ὁ Τειρεσίας νίκην ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Θηβαίοις, ἐὰν ὁ παῖς Κρέοντος Μενοικεὺς σφάγιον Ἄρει γένηται[63]—with *Bibl.* 3, 6, 7 Οὗτος οὖν Θηβαίοις μαντευομένοις εἶπε νικήσειν, ἐὰν Μενοικεὺς ὁ Κρέοντος Ἄρει σφάγιον αὑτὸν ἐπιδῶι.[64] These similarities do not constitute sufficient proof of a direct link between Apd. and the *hypp.* though parts of Apd. may go back to a collection of *hypp.* or to a source of this collection through intermediaries.[65]

This use of intermediaries certainly supports the current opinion on the sources of the *Bibl.*[66] Several secondary works seem to have been used by Apd. As far as the sources of *Bibl.* book one are concerned, Söder (1939: 165) concludes:

> dass Apd., namentlich was den Aufbau seiner Darstellung betrifft, in überraschend starkem Masse auf Hesiod, überhaupt der epischen Tradition fusst.[67] (...) Erweitert ist dieses System des epischen Kyklos zu

---

[61] Compare also *Phrixus* I (16 fr. 14.3 and 14, 18ff.) with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 1 and *Phoenissae* (15, 12-14 and 16 frr. 48; 125; 17.4, 1-5) with *Bibl.* 3, 6, 7 Οὗτος οὖν Θηβαίοις κτλ.

[62] This text is not preserved in 1a.

[63] This text is based on mss. MABV, cf. OCT Murray, whereas the following text printed by Diggle in his OCT is based on both papyri and med. mss.: Τειρεσίας δὲ ἔχρησε νικήσειν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐὰν ὁ Κρέοντος υἱὸς Μενοικεὺς σφάγιον Ἄρει γένηται.

[64] Cf. further *Helena* with *Epit.* 3, 5; *Medea* with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 28; *Troades* with *Epit.* 5, 23.

[65] A similar conclusion is drawn by Huys (1997 *RhM*) who provides a more extensive survey of the verbal agreements between Apd. and the *hypp.*

[66] The main studies are: Robert (1873: 49-91); Bethe (1887); Schwartz (1894: 2875-86); Söder (1939); Van der Valk (1958: 114-164); and West (1985).

[67] Her conclusion is confirmed by West (1985: 45): "The fact remains that in its genealogical sections it (= the *Bibl.*) agrees extensively with the *Catalogue*, and the *Catalogue* seems to have provided the model for the whole order of presentation."

> einem mythologischen Kyklos durch die Aufnahme neugestalteter Sagenformen, namentlich aus der Tragödie und auch aus der alexandrinischen Poesie.

Apd. and similar works like those of Hyg. and Diodorus have not used these sources directly, but only through excerpts, summaries, commentaries, and retellings, which were continuously altered and contaminated.[68] Söder arrives at this conclusion as follows (164-165):

> Das ergibt sich aus den Übereinstimmungen Apds. mit jenen Darstellungen, namentlich in Zügen, die über das zugrunde liegende Original hinausweisen (...) Eine allen Darstellungen zugrunde liegende Quelle ist überhaupt unwahrscheinlich, wie die mannigfachen Abweichungen zeigen, die sich zwischen den einzelnen Darstellungen finden. Das gilt auch für Bethes Zurückleitung der verschiedenen Darstellungen auf das eine Handbuch.

This conclusion is also applicable to the *Fab.* of Hyg., a collection of mythical stories and catalogues of uncertain date (somewhere between the first century BC and the second AD).[69] The present contents and order of the stories are not the original work of Hyg., but rather the result of considerable changes in the course of time. It now starts with genealogies of gods and heroes followed by mythical narratives that are partly arranged by subject matter. *Fab.* 12-27, for example, deal with the Argonauts and related matters, 29-36 with Heracles, and between these two groups appears a stray story 28 about Otus and Ephialtes. Among the stories occur several catalogues, but the majority of them are given from 221 onwards, cf. below p. 152.

As can be deduced from the presence of Greek words,[70] the *Fab.* are rooted in the Greek mythographical tradition. Dietze (1890) observes in the first part of his dissertation that the present text of the *Fab.* must differ considerably from the original text which has not

---

[68] This also appears from the comparison of the Homeric *hypp.* with Apd. *Epit.* 4, 3ff. and *Tabula Iliaca* 1A. The latter texts are based on an excerpt from the *Il.* whereas the Homeric *hypp.* are closely linked to the original poem, cf. p. 70f.

[69] I use the ed. of Marshall (1993) with an extensive bibliography on XV-XX; on the history of the text, cf. his preface, Tolkiehn (1917: 636-640) and Breen (1991: 1-19). The date and authorship of the *Fab.* are still disputed: some scholars suggest an early date and identify Hyg. with Augustus' librarian Iulius Hyginus (cf. Le Boeuffle 1983: XXXIff.), others reject this identification, cf. Häussler (1984: 16 n. 20), Marshall (1993: IX-XII) and Huys (1996 *APF*: 168 n. 5). Breen (1991: 1-19) gives a survey of the literature on this problem and concludes that the work is of more than one stage and perhaps even of more than one author.

[70] Cf. the examples given in App. One 2.2.

survived. He further argues that the traces of Latin poetry may partly stem from Hyg. and may partly reflect later additions.[71]

Hyg. has many subjects in common with Apd., several scholia, Euripides and the narrative *hypp.* The agreements with the latter two have often been emphasized but they are actually quite limited.[72] A comparison of the *hypp.* with Hyg. yields even fewer similarities than in the case of Apd. The differences between the two versions usually outweigh the agreements; compare, for example, the *hyp.* to *Scyrii* (**12**, 38ff.) with Hyg. *Fab.* 96: *Thetis Nereis cum sciret Achillem filium suum quem ex Peleo habebat, si ad Troiam expugnandam isset, periturum, commendauit eum in insulam Scyron ad Lycomedem regem, quem ille inter uirgines filias habitu femineo seruabat nomine mutato* ... Only the words underlined resemble the text of the *hyp.*, and Achilles' affair with Lycomedes' daughter Deidamia (cf. **12**, 43-48) is not at all present in Hyg. (cf. Huys 1996 *APF*: 177). The same picture appears in other cases, as is demonstrated by Huys who compares the following *Fab.* with verbal correspondences with the narrative *hypp.* in Part I of his article (1996 *APF*: 173ff.): *Fab.* 2 and 3 with the *hypp.* to *Phrixus* I and II in **14** and **16**; *Fab.* 47 with **7**, *Hipp.* I and the med. *hyp.* to *Hipp.* II; *Fab.* 68 and 69 with the *hyp.* to *Ph.* (med. and cf. **15**, **16**); *Fab.* 120 with the med. *hyp.* to *IT*; *Fab.* 184 with the *hyp.* to *Ba.* (med. and cf. **4**). More examples occur in Part II of Huys' paper (1997 *APF*: 11-30) which is a survey of the most important *Fab.* that have been connected with Euripidean tragedy.[73] Compare, for instance, *Fab.* 51 with med. *hyp. Alc.* and *Fab.* 91 with **1b** *hyp.* to *Alex.* In short, there is no evidence that indicates a direct link between the

[71] An example of a *Fab.* based on Latin poetry is 181, which has used Ovid, *Met.* 3, 206ff. for a list of Actaeon's dogs. Robert (1878: 15), Wilamowitz (1886: 49 n. 9), and Bethe (1887: 98) consider all Latin matters interpolations, but the (lack of) evidence favours Dietze's statement.

[72] This is recently demonstrated in an excellent article by Marc Huys (1996 *APF*: 168-178). See p. 170 n. 12 for a lengthy enumeration of scholars who suggest that the *Fab.* depend on the collection of narrative *hypp.*

[73] The following *Fab.* are discussed: 24, 25, 29, 40, 46, 49+51, 57, 63, 64, 66+67, 72, 74, 86-88, 91, 98, 101, 102, 103+104, 105, 119, 123, 137+184[ex], 154, 172+174, 186, 187 and 219. After this survey Huys rightly concludes (p. 30): "The main conclusions of this paper are, then, first that there seems to be no direct relationship between the 'Tales from Euripides' and the 'Fabulae', and second that we should forcefully reject the tendency still found in modern general studies on Greek literature or tragedy, and even in specialized studies on Euripides' fragmentary plays, to derive uncritically the contents of lost Euripidean tragedies from the 'Fabulae' of Hyginus."

narrative *hypp.* and Hyg. Söder's conclusions about Apd. and his sources cited above also hold for Hyg.: the use of summaries, excerpts and intermediaries and the process of contamination seem to be the key words that explain the agreements and differences between Hyg. and other works.

At the end of this section on Apd. and Hyg., a summary is given of the most important stylistic characteristics of the narrative *hypp.* contrasted with those of Apd., Hyg. and Parthenius.[74] The finite verbs of the main sentences in the *hypp.* are only indicatives of past tense, whereas the other writings employ indicatives of present and past tense. The *hypp.* mainly consist of single sentences with many participles whereas the other group has more compound sentences and other characteristics such as indirect discourse (cf. esp. Parthenius) or direct speech (cf. esp. Hyg.). The sentences in the *hypp.* are primarily connected by δέ or by μέν-δέ and less often by καί or γάρ. In the other texts, δέ and καί are most numerous, but μέν-δέ, γάρ, ἀλλά, τε and demonstrative pronouns instead of conjunctions also connect sentences.[75]

The following phenomenon is also noteworthy: in contrast to the mythographers, the *hypp.* only employ as many words as are necessary to understand the story, which consists of background information and an account of the plot. They do not use two words or expressions instead of one, or many double indications such as *Procrin coniugem* in Hyg. *Fab.* 189, where one of the two words would have been enough. Adjectives, adverbs and negations are most times indispensable constituents of the story, which are used in order to stress certain matters (cf. p. 10). Another feature of the narrative *hypp.* is the avoidance of repetitions, not only of proper names but also of words in general. This tendency is far weaker in the other texts, where we find both variation and repetition. To conclude, the narrative *hypp.* distinguish themselves from the other mythographic texts by their economic and deliberate use of words and by the past tenses. They are not haphazard synopses but retellings with a characteristic style.

---

[74] App. One contains observations on the writings of Apd., Hyg. and Parthenius which form the basis for the present survey.

[75] μέν-δέ antitheses are often mentioned as an important characteristic of the narrative *hypp.* but such antitheses are quite common in Greek texts in general and they also abound in the other mythographical texts, cf. App. One 3.2 for examples in Parthenius.

1.7 Function and readership

Why were these *hypp.* written? How and by whom were they read and used? Since ancient literature provides no explicit answers to these questions, we have to draw inferences from the papyri themselves. As we have seen, most papyrus texts stem from large collections of *hypp.* ordered alphabetically by initial. Not only does this arrangement and the citations of the first lines suggest links with scholarship, but also, for example, the occurrence of *hypp.* to both *Phrixus* I and II. Such a distinction may point to a scholarly origin. On the other hand, neither the form nor the physical appearance, nor the contents of the individual *hypp.* denote a scholarly usage. Notes on production, performance and variant versions are absent, whereas mythographical information, such as the names of characters which are not mentioned in the plays themselves, has been added. Moreover, several discrepancies from the plays can be found (cf. p. 5). The readers were obviously more interested in a clear mythographical story than in the precise representation of the play. This idea is confirmed by the use of the narrative past tense instead of the present common to synopses.

To return to the alphabetical order, it is likely that this fulfils a function. It enables the reader to select and read only those passages in which he/she takes an interest. The chief purpose of the narrative *hypp.* was probably to present a source of information which could be consulted by people who wanted to have quick access to the main mythical persons and events treated in specific tragedies. A secondary use may also be discerned, for several *hypp.* stem from an educational context: **3** and **13** are school exercises which seem to be based on *hypp.*[76] **6** and perhaps **15** (see comm.) may correspond to a more advanced stage of education, in which the *hypp.* may have been used for rhetorical exercises. The occurrence of *hypp.* in Byzantine rhetoricians (see p. 24) confirms their didactic function.

Thirdly, papyrus **9**, in which the *hyp.* to *Medea* is preceded by that to *Peliades*, seems to have a thematic instead of the usual alphabetic order. This suggests a different usage too: continuous reading of one *hyp.* after the other is now more likely than selective reading, though the latter is of course still possible. The order of the *hypp.* agrees with the order of the stories about the Peliades and Medea in the mytho-

[76] For Marrou's suggestion (1948: 229) that the *hypp.* were given to children when they started to learn to read, cf. ch. 2 n. 50.

graphical works of Hyg. and Apd. (cf. *Fab.* 24 and 25 and *Bibl.* 1, 9, 27ff.). This also brings us to the connections between the narrative *hypp.* and the stories of Apd. and Hyg. (cf. p. 25ff.): even if we cannot prove a direct dependence between these works, it is possible that the mythographers used sources which were based on the *hypp.* To conclude, the narrative *hypp.* seem to have enjoyed a fairly wide readership, who used them in various ways.

2 *Learned hypotheses*

2.1 *Introduction*

Not only the *hypp.* of Aristophanes of Byzantium fall under this heading, but also another group of *hypp.*, which has been distinguished by Budé and contains learned information.[77] He discerns the following elements (171): interest in the *μυθοποιία*, a résumé, interest in the title, interest in the prologue, didascalic information, and a reference to Dicaearchus as source. There are also many citations from earlier works (cf. Budé 175-176). I refrain from a fuller discussion of this kind of *hypp.*, since the only papyrus (19) which preserves traces of this type, is too fragmentary to bring new conclusive evidence.[78]

Aristophanes of Byzantium (258/255-180 BC) is generally accepted as the author of the second and most known group of learned *hypp.*, for which he made use of Callimachus' chronological *Pinax* of the dramatic poets.[79] Though not one *hyp.* of Aristophanes of Byzan-

[77] Budé (173) calls this type 'saga-*hypp.*' because they show a special interest in the relationship between myth and play. He argues that the following *hypp.* belong to this group: *Aj.*, *Rh. I*, *Med. I*, *Alc. I*, *Hel.*, *OT II*, *OC II*, *Pers. II.*

[78] Budé's distinction (121-187) seems valuable, but the subsequent conclusion that this group represents the *hypp.* of Dicaearchus in an altered form (cf. 199 "... conclusie dat in de sage-hypotheseis in feite Dicaearchus' *ὑποθέϲειϲ* voor ons liggen, zij het niet meer in hun oorspronkelijke vorm"), is to be questioned. Cf. the review by Holwerda (1983: 173-176). See also Rusten (1982: n. 35) who sees no merit in Budé's 'saga-*hypp.*' traced back to Dicaearchus.

[79] Achelis (1913: 416) points to the following text: Et. gen. B s.v. *πίναξ* ... *πίνακαϲ ... οἷϲ ἐντυχὼν ὁ γραμματικὸϲ ἐποιήϲατο τὰϲ ὑποθέϲειϲ τῶν δραμάτων* (cf. Call. ed. Pf. fr. 456); see also Pfeiffer (1968: 193). Aristophanes' date is derived from Pfeiffer (1968: 172). Brown (1987: 427-431) expresses doubt about the attribution to Aristophanes.

tium seems to have survived in its original form, Budé enumerates the constituents and reconstructs the following order:[80]
a. a résumé of only one or two sentences, which is restricted to the contents of the play: e.g. *Med.* Μήδεια διὰ τὴν πρὸς Ἰάσονα ἔχθραν τῶι ἐκεῖνον γεγαμηκέναι τὴν Κρέοντος θυγατέρα ἀπέκτεινε μὲν Γλαύκην καὶ Κρέοντα καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους υἱούς, ἐχωρίσθη δὲ Ἰάσονος Αἰγεῖ συνοικήσουσα.
b. the so-called μυθοποιία, a note about the treatment of the same subject by the three major tragedians. A standard formula was used: ἡ μυθοποιία κεῖται παρὰ ... ἐν ... or παρ' οὐδετέρωι κεῖται ἡ μυθοποιία.
c. information on the place of the action (*locus actionis*), the identity of the chorus, and the prologue speaker. We encounter the following phrases: ἡ μὲν σκηνὴ [τοῦ δράματος] ὑπόκειται ἐν ... (rarely ἐπὶ/παρὰ); ὁ δὲ χορὸς [συνέστηκεν] ἐκ ...; προλογίζει δὲ ...
d. τὸ κεφάλαιον, an enumeration of substantives telling the main events of the play.[81] Budé has indiscriminately adopted Achelis' assertion (1914: 138) that σκοπός, used in the comedies, indicates the main events precisely as κεφάλαιον does in the tragedies. However, Achelis' examples clearly show that σκοπός has its usual meaning 'aim, end, object': cf. e.g. *Av.* III ὁ δὲ σκοπὸς τοῦ δράματος διασῦραι πάλιν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὡς φιλοδίκους.[82] This sentence tells us about the aim of the comedy and therefore of its author. So it is completely different from the usual enumeration of substantives after κεφάλαιον: cf. *Ant.* I τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιόν ἐστι τάφος Πολυνείκους, Ἀντιγόνης ἀναίρεσις, θάνατος Αἵμονος καὶ μόρος Εὐρυδίκης τῆς Αἵμονος μητρός.

The terminology used in the *hypp.* is rather confused: instead of κεφάλαιον, A. *Th.* has ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεσις στρατιὰ Ἀργείων ... καὶ θάνατος Ἐ. καὶ Πολυνείκους[83] and in *Pax* I κεφάλαιον occurs instead of

---

[80] The reconstruction in Budé (cf. 33-39) is based on Achelis' study (1913-1914).

[81] Similar enumerations occur in the nominal Homeric *hypp.* on papyrus (cf. 36) and in the med. mss., and in two papyri with tables of contents, *P.Ryl.* 1, 19 and *P.Oxy.* 4, 665, cf. p. 73. The heading κεφάλαια indicates in other writings all kinds of summaries and indexes: cf. the beginnings in e.g. Iamb. *Protr.*; Ps.-Plu. *Placit.*; sch. A.R. (ed. Wendel 1935) the arguments preceding books 2-4.

[82] See also *Eq.* II, *Av.* II (instead of στίχος Achelis reads σκοπὸς), *Ran.* IV.

[83] Holwerda (1976: 197 n. 56) writes "Hier (= A. *Th.*) liest man ὑπόθεσις statt κεφάλαιον. (So ebenfalls in Hyp. Aesch. *Pers.* (...)) Für diese Bedeutung des Wortes ὑπόθεσις vgl. sch. Aesch. *Cho.* 145 ἐν κεφαλαίωι, ἐν ὑποθέσει τίθημι. Die Ersetzung des Wortes κεφάλαιον durch ὑπόθεσις verrät, wie ich glaube, eine spätere Überarbeitung. Der Gebrauch des Wortes ὑπόθεσις in diesem Sinne (etwa "Hauptthema") ist vielleicht der rhetorischen Fachsprache entnommen, vgl. oben

cκοπόc: τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον τῆc κωμωιδίαc ἐcτὶ τοῦτο· cυμβουλεύει Ἀθηναίοιc cπείcαcθαι πρὸc Λακεδαιμονίουc καὶ τοὺc ἄλλουc Ἕλληναc.
e. the *διδαcκαλικά*, the date of the first performance, the results of the competition (which place each poet gained with his plays), the title and the number the piece had in the Alexandrian library, or the remark *οὐ cώιζεται* if the play was not in the library. Cf. e.g. E. *Med.* *ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἄρχοντοc ὀλυμπιάδοc πζ' ἔτει πρώτωι. Πρῶτοc Εὐφορίων, δεύτεροc Cοφοκλῆc, τρίτοc Εὐριπίδηc Μηδείαι Φιλοκτήτηι Δίκτυι Θεριcταῖc cατύροιc. Οὐ cώιζεται.*
f. an evaluation of the entire play (e.g. *τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν πρώτων*) and of parts of it.
It appears from this survey that fixed formulas are used in many parts of this kind of *hypp.* There is no universal agreement on the question whether the *index personarum* formed part of these *hypp.* or whether it was a later addition. It is also uncertain whether all elements enumerated were always included in one *hyp.* and whether the order as presented by Budé is correct. For example, only A. *Pr.* and S. *Ant.* I contain both elements a and d. It seems to be superfluous to give an enumeration of main themes when the outline of the plot has already been given.

One, or maybe two, papyri (**20**, **21**) concerned with Aeschylus contain parts of this type of *hypp.* See also **19**, fr. 4→.

2.2 Papyri

19 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 29779 (*MPER* N.S. 1, 24)

These fragments stem from a papyrus codex written in a regular, angular capital, sloping to the right and assigned to the end of the fourth or to the fifth century AD. A second hand, somewhat smaller and with a greater slant, has written fr. 2↓. Final *ν* is indicated by a supralinear stroke. No lectional signs appear, apart from an occasional high stop in fr. 3→ l. 3. There are two errors.

S. 191, Anm. 46. (...)." Holwerda remarks that the *hyp.* to A. *Pers.* is also introduced by *ὑπόθεcιc* instead of by *κεφάλαιον*, but the argument of *Pers.* is different from the examples quoted because it does not consist of an enumeration of substantives: *ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεcιc Ξέρξηc cτρατευcάμενοc κατὰ Ἑλλάδοc καὶ πεζῆι μὲν ἔτι ἐν Πλαταιαῖc νικηθείc, ναυτικῆι δὲ ἐν Cαλαμῖνι, διὰ Θεccαλίαc φεύγων διεπεραιώθη εἰc τὴν Ἀcίαν.*

The fragments preserve remains of various *hypp.* to Sophocles' tragedies. Luppe (re-ed.) states that fr. 1 is part of a Sophocles-Vita, but this is rather uncertain. Fr. 2→ is an unknown *hyp.* to *Philoctetes* and has no fixed formulas. Fr. 2↓ preserves parts of seven lines of a metrical *hyp.* to *OT*, different from the one in the med. mss. Since it is the only piece written in a second hand and metrical, it may have been added to the original text by someone else. Fr. 3a,b↓ is part of the *hyp.* to *OT* transmitted in the med. mss. under the title Διὰ τί Τύραννοϲ ἐπιγέγραπται. It belongs, according to Budé (157-161), to the saga-*hypp.* The papyrus fragment preserves part of the passage that deals with the title. Fr. 3a,b→ is part of the known *hyp.* to *OC* IV ascribed to Sallustius.[84] Fr. 4↓ may be part of an unknown *hyp.* to *Ajax*. Fr. 4→ includes parts of the formulas found in the learned (Aristoph. of Byz.) *hypp.* under c, regarding the chorus and the prologue speaker. These remarks could refer to many plays, among others to *OC*. Luppe suggests that fr. 5→ might belong to an unknown *hyp.* to *OC*, which is rather uncertain. Fr. 5↓ is not identified.

These papyrus fragments evoke more questions than answers: does this Sophocles codex contain only *hypp.*, or rather *hypp.* followed by plays? Is this a collection of various types of *hypp.*, two learned ones and that ascribed to Sallustius, irrespective of the metrical one, or do our fragments belong to one learned type, of which the original form does not occur in the med. mss.? Do these *hypp.* follow a specific order? There seems to be no alphabetical arrangement as is usual in the narrative *hypp.*

20 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2256, frr. 1-5

These scraps contain comments, which have been inserted by the original scribe in the margins of rolls containing plays of Aeschylus. The hand is upright and rectangular, slowly written, markedly bilinear and assigned to the later part of the second or the earlier part of the third century AD. The back is blank. Some accents, diaereses, high stops, spacings, and monogrammatic abbreviations are used. Iota adscript is written and has once been erroneously inserted.[85]

---

[84] Budé (202-205) argues primarily against Wilamowitz (1910: 198-199) that the *hypp.* to *Ajax* and *OT* II should not be ascribed to Sallustius in contrast to the *hypp.* on *OC* IV and *Ant.* II, which are ascribed to him in the med. mss.

[85] This description is based on *GMAW* 25.

The fragments contain some of the enumerated elements of the learned Aristophanes' *hypp.*: fr. 1 mentions a prologue speaker (part of c) followed by the beginning of an *index personarum* of a *hyp.* to the *Laius*; fr. 2 has the first two items of e, presumably regarding the *Laius*; fr. 3 offers the first two items of e regarding the *Danaides*;[86] fr. 4 has all items of c of an unidentified *hyp.*; fr. 5 seems to have the end of a and b concerning the *Philoctetes.*

21 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2257, fr. 1

Fr. 1 is written in a small, distinctive hand employed for annotation. It is assigned to the later second century AD. There are many abbreviations, one diaeresis and one itacism; a paragraphus concludes this text. Underneath the last line are about 7.5 cm of blank papyrus and the back is blank. The other unidentified fragments preserve about a dozen letters of the annotated text and more of the annotation.

This fragment might refer to the *Eumenides*, then mentions 'Αχιλλέωϲ ἐραϲταί, which is a satyr play by Sophocles, and then, seems to give a survey of the places where the five scenes of the Αἰτναῖαι of Aeschylus take place. Whether this text is really part of a *hyp.* (*locus actionis*) or rather a sort of commentary (cf. γάρ in l. 8) comparing the *Aetnaeae* to other plays in which changes of scene are found cannot be concluded.

2.3 Function and readership

Instead of concentrating on the contents of the plays, the learned *hypp.* provide information which gives the reader an idea of both the contents and the historical setting of the play. The *hypp.* concerned with Aeschylus' plays (20, 21) were not written for their own sakes; they were added to the text of the plays themselves, as appears from their marginal hand and position. This tendency and the use of abbreviations leads to the supposition that these texts were working copies intended for the private use of scholars.[87] The *hypp.* in 19 may have also served as ancillary texts but our lack of knowledge about the precise contents of the entire codex prohibits further conclusions.

---

[86] This fragment is extensively discussed by Garvie (1969: 1-28).
[87] For abbreviations, cf. *GMAW* p. 15; Turner (1968: 95-96); McNamee (1981).

3 Descriptive hypothesis

3.1 Introduction

Apart from one papyrus with a *hyp.* of one of Cratinus' most famous plays, *Dionysalexandros*, several *hypp.* of plays of Aristophanes transmitted in the med. mss. belong to the group of descriptive *hypp.*[88] Körte (1904: 496-497) ascribes these *hypp.* to Symmachus, a grammarian concerned with Aristophanes and active about 100 AD. In view of the wording, Radermacher (1921: 79) arrives at the same periodization but is unwilling to ascribe the *hypp.* to Symmachus for the following reason: "es müssten denn entsprechende Einleitungen zu anderen Komödien, die schon bei Symmachus standen, verloren gegangen sein." This is, however, not impossible.

In his discussion of these *hypp.*, Budé merely remarks that the *hypp.* show a certain similarity to the 'Tales from Euripides', my narrative *hypp.*, and that they restrict themselves to an account of the play without any didascalic information. However, the difference is quite obvious: the narrative *hyp.* retells the contents of the play with verbs in the past tense, while these *hypp.* describe the (course of the) performance of the play with verbs in the present tense; we find references to activities on the stage, for example, to the *parabasis* of the chorus: *hyp.* Ar. *Pax* I: ὁ μὲν χορὸϲ περὶ τῆϲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τέχνηϲ χἀτέρων τινῶν πρὸϲ τοὺϲ θεατὰϲ διαλέγεται, and see ll. 6ff. of Cratinus' text. In both texts, the θεαταί are mentioned as well. In view of this, the term 'descriptive *hypp.*' seems preferable to Budé's designation 'narrative *hypp.* to the comedies'.

3.2 Papyrus

22 *P.Oxy.* 4, 663

The *hyp.* to Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* is written in a small uncial hand assigned to the late second century or the first half of the third. There are numerous abbreviations, some corruptions and corrections,

---

[88] For the designation 'descriptive *hypp.*', see below. Budé's enumeration of med. *hypp.* of this type (cf. 61-66) is based on Radermacher (1921: 74-79): *Ra.* I, *Ach.* I, *Eq.* I, *Lys.* I, *Nu.* III, *Pax* I, *Pl.* III + IV. Körte (1904: 481-498) also mentions *V.* I, *Av.* III and *Pl.* II instead of *Pl.* III + IV, but these *hypp.* show more differences than similarities.

and one diaeresis. The high stop is occasionally employed, and spaces sometimes accompanied by a marginal paragraphus are used to indicate a pause. The back is blank. The general appearance of this fragment resembles that of 20 and 21.

Parts of two columns are preserved, the first offers the text of the *hyp.* itself, which continues in col. II underneath the title Διονυϲ[αλέ-ξανδροϲ| η [| Κρατ[είνου written in much larger uncials. The strange position of the title seems to have originated as follows: first, the papyrus roll only contained the text of the play preceded by a large blank space in which the title was written.[89] Thereafter, the *hyp.* was added in the blank space to the left of the title and beneath it. This means that the *hyp.* was probably prefixed to the text of the *Dionysalexandros*, in contrast to the narrative *hypp.* and the prose *hypp.* of Menander which stem from collections of *hypp.* and are not transmitted together with the texts of the plays. Yet it is not unthinkable that this *hyp.* once formed part of a collection of *hypp.*

The *hyp.* proper is followed by a remarkable explanatory note: κωμῳδεῖται δ' ἐν τῷ δράματι Περικλῆϲ μάλα πιθανῶϲ δι' ἐμφάϲεωϲ ὡϲ ἐπαγηοχὼϲ τοῖϲ 'Αθηναίοιϲ τὸν πόλεμον. In the *hypp.* to Aristophanes, this place is usually occupied by a succinct appreciation of the play, cf. e.g. *Ach.* I τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν εὖ ϲφόδρα πεποιημένων καὶ ἐκ παντὸϲ τρόπου τὴν εἰρήνην προκαλούμενον. In several med. *hypp.* didascalic information follows, but that might have been added in the course of transmission.

The *hyp.* consists of single sentences connected by δέ, μέν-δέ, and καί. The finite verbs of the main sentences are present indicatives, which is reflective of its descriptive nature. Predicate participles outnumber those of the narrative *hypp.*; almost every sentence contains two participles or more, which are linked by (τε) καί or μέν-δέ, or which occur without links in the case of future participles, cf. ll. 37-41 ὀκνούϲηϲ - ἀποϲτέλλει. There is one genitive absolute (37-38) instead of a circumstantial participle (on this phenomenon, cf. p. 9 n. 28).

[89] Cf. the blank space before the first column of text in *P.Mich.* 6, 390: "Some 6.5 cm. from the text and 13.5 cm. from the left edge, slightly above the center of the free space, is the title arranged in two lines." See also *P.Harr.* 123. On the title and its position, cf. Luppe (1966: 184ff.), who argues that η is not a number but must precede an alternative title, for instance 'Ιδαῖοι. See also Handley (1982: 114-115): he suggests that the title of our papyrus is perhaps written by the same hand as *P.Oxy.* 37, 2806, which is a fragment from Cratinus.

Concerning vocabulary, proper names alternate with oblique cases of αὐτός and demonstrative pronouns including the article used as a demonstrative. As far as the other parts of speech are concerned: several types of pronouns, a negation, some adjectives, and adverbial expressions occur. The two phrases μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα and μετ' ὀλίγον (ll. 20, 23-4) are typical for the descriptive *hypp.*[90]

3.3 Function and readership

Since the *hyp.* to *Dionysalexandros* was probably prefixed to its play, it is likely to have functioned as an introduction. Contrary to the narrative *hypp.*, where the story is of foremost importance, this kind of *hyp.* focuses on the performance of the play. It helps the reader to visualize the position and actions of chorus and actors. Whether this *hyp.* has been derived from a larger collection of *hypp.*, is impossible to answer. In view of the frequent use of abbreviations, it seems probable that the papyrus text was written for private use, perhaps for the working purposes of a scholar (cf. Turner (1968: 96).

4 Menandrean hypotheses

Section 4.1.1 introduces the prose *hypp.* to plays of Menander, whereas 4.1.2 is concerned with the metrical ones. The papyri of both types are discussed in §4.2, and §4.3 offers some suggestions on function and readership of both prose and metric Menandrean *hypp.*

4.1.1 Introduction to prose hypotheses

Compared to the narrative *hypp.* of tragedies, which consist of a three-lined heading plus retelling, the prose *hypp.* of Menander have more elements:[91] after the title, οὗ/ἧς/ὧν ἀρχή, and the first-line quotation (*incipit*), we see didascalic information, that is, information about the date of the play, the performance, and presumably the number of the piece in the Alexandrian library. After this, ἡ δ(ὲ) ὑπόθεσις introduces the summary of the contents of the play, and this is

---

[90] On the characteristics of the med. *hypp.*, see also Körte (1904: 496-497) and esp. Radermacher (1921: 75ff.).

[91] Cf. Budé (53-60), who adopts Körte's term *periochae* for these *hypp.* For a discussion of the term, see below.

followed by an appreciation of the qualities of the play itself and/or of separate roles. The didascalic information given in the *hypp.* of Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. p. 34) is more extensive and written down with the help of fixed formulas in contrast to 26, 105-112 and perhaps 23, 10ff., cf. comm.

The Menandrean *hypp.* stem from a collection of *hypp.* arranged alphabetically by initial. According to Körte,[92] to whom many scholars refer, their author must be Homerus Sellius, a grammarian probably from the first century AD. Körte links the notes on Sellius found in the Suda[93] with 26—the other papyri were not yet published—and concludes:

> Diese ganze Anlage (a description of 26 pre-cedes) entspricht genau dem, was wir von S.s περιοχαί erwarten dür-fen, und da es ganz unwahrscheinlich ist, dass zwei Grammatiker sich die Mühe gemacht haben, von allen 105 Stücken Menanders genaue Inhaltsangaben anzufertigen, werden wir in dem Papyrus das Werk des S. erkennen dürfen.

This identification is probable but far from certain. Sellius' *periochae* are not necessarily the same as the *hypp.* on papyrus. I will therefore refrain from adopting the term '*periochae*', which does not occur in the papyri.[94] The papyri, of which the earliest (23) is assigned to the end of the first century AD, provide a terminus ante quem for the author of these *hypp.* On the characteristics, see the description of 26.

4.1.2 Introduction to metrical hypotheses

Though the papyri mentioned in this paragraph are the only subliterary texts in this book not written in prose, they are included for the

[92] Körte (1918: 787-791) and (1923: 1321-1322, based on previous publication).

[93] Suda: Ὅμηρος Cέλλιος χρηματίςας, γραμματικός. ἐποίηςε τάδε· ὕμνους, παίγνια δι' ἐπῶν, εἴδη πλεῖςτα· καταλογάδην Περὶ τῶν κωμικῶν προςώπων, Περιοχὰς τῶν Μενάνδρου δραμάτων, and Cέλλιος ἢ Cίλλιος, ὁ καὶ Ὅμηρος, γραμματικὸς πρὸ Μενάνδρου.

[94] ἡ περιοχή means summary, see LSJ I2c. Cf. the metrical summaries of Terentius' comedies, which are introduced by "*G. Sulpici Apollinaris periocha*" in cod. Bembinus; on these summaries, cf. *RE* s.v. Sulpicius Apollinaris. See also Ps.-Ausonius' *Periochae Homeri Iliadis et Odyssiae* discussed on p. 69; the scholia on A.R. book 4, which begin with a prose summary of the contents preceded by a double heading "Περιοχὴ τοῦ δ' τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν, Τοῦ δ' τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν τὰ κεφάλαιά ἐςτι ταῦτα."; and the *Periochae* of Livius, cf. the Loeb text and translation by Schlesinger (1967) and for brief discussions of the *Periochae*, see Wille (1973: 56-58), Luce (1977: 10-12) and Brunt (1980: 488). All these *Periochae* summarize the contents of the original writings without giving didascalic or other information, contrary to the Menandrean prose *hypp.*

sake of completeness and comparison. As the title already indicates, these *hypp.* are written in verses, iambic trimeters. The ascription of the metrical *hypp.* to Aristophanes of Byzantium and their date are much disputed matters notwithstanding the appearance of the name Aristophanes in **27**.[95] Apart from the metrical *hypp.* transmitted to us in the med. mss. on Sophocles *OT*, *Ph.*, and all comedies of Aristophanes except for *Thesm.*, there are three on papyrus: to the *Dyscolus* and *Heros* of Menander (cf. **27**, **28**) and part of a *hyp.* to *OT* (cf. **19**, fr. 2).

4.2 Papyri

23 *P.Oxy.* 31, 2534

This papyrus contains part of one column of writing in a careful and elegant upright book hand which makes much use of serifs and has been assigned to the end of the first century AD. The back of the papyrus is blank.

This scrap preserves the end of one *hyp.*—the end of the summary and an evaluation of the play—followed by the title B̄ Αὑτὸν [τιμωρούμενοϲ], probably οὗ ἀρχή, perhaps in ll. 8-9 a citation of the first line, and what looks like some (didascalic) information about the relationship between this play and another.[96] The β that precedes the title probably signifies that the *Heauton Timorumenus* was the second play discussed in this collection of *hypp.*, which is likely to have followed the alphabetic arrangement.

24 *P.IFAO* inv. 337

This small piece of papyrus is written in a fair-sized, regular, upright capital, markedly bilinear and attributed to the second century AD. The hand is very similar to **26** but better executed and some letters

---

[95] Budé (40-47) gives a survey of the arguments in favour of and against Aristophanes' authorship. The metre and verse technique of the med. *hypp.* seems to support the argument for Aristophanes, cf. Michel (1908: 19-27); Wagner (1908: 5-6); Koster (1962: 47-48). A different opinion regarding **27** is stated by Handley (1965: 121): "Neither the presence of A.'s name nor the evidence of Alexandrian scholarship in the didascalia can tell us anything about the date of the verses, which may fall well within the Christian era." See also Brown (1987: 427).

[96] See the discussion in *ed. pr.* = *CQ* ns 15, 1965, 56-57.

are written differently. There is one high stop and a paragraphus. The back is blank. Two itacistic writings appear.

It contains an appreciation of the characters of a play, probably *Demiurgus*, succeeded by the title plus *οὗ ἀρχή* and the first line of *Dis exapaton*.

25 *P.Oxy.* 60, 4020

On the front of this scrap written parallel with the fibres and 7 cm from the top is a *hyp.* in a small, neat hand, rather featureless except for occasional serifs, to be assigned to the second century AD. It is preceded by five beginnings of an ornamental heading in a larger script. Lines are ca. seventeen letters long. On the back, in a coarse hand, are line-ends from an account.

επ[or *ειτ*[(l.1) is written before the rest of the heading which consists of the title *Epitrepontes* and the quotation of the first line. The main part is an appreciation which discusses the characters of the play by function, not by name (cf. **24** and **26**, 95ff.).

26 *P.Oxy.* 10, 1235

This papyrus presents a rather large upright capital, rapidly written, markedly bilinear with a few ligatures. It is attributed to the first half of the second century AD. There is one possible high stop in l. 105, but the usual method of indicating a pause is a short blank space, sometimes accompanied by a marginal paragraphus. We find some errors and itacistic spellings, an occasional correction and one line-filler in l. 62 of the usual angular shape. The back is blank. Lines are eighteen to twenty-three letters long.

The remains of the first column contain the end of one *hyp.* (probably of a play, the title of which begins with Θ-) followed by the beginning of the *Iereia*, of which the greater part of the *ὑπόθεϲιϲ* and appreciation are preserved in the second and third column. The latter also has the indented heading *Ἴμβριοι ὧν ἀρχή*, the quotation of the first line written two letters in ekthesis, didascalic information (ll. 105-112) concerning the date, number and circumstances of the production of the play, and the story of the *Imbrioi* introduced by the indented words *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ*.

Only this papyrus is extensive enough to examine the syntax and vocabulary of the actual *hypp.* (ll. 22-94 and 114ff.). Apart from a few final and relative subordinate clauses, the *hypp.* consist of single sentences linked by *δέ* and sometimes by *μέν-δέ*, *καί*, and *διὸ καὶ μετὰ*

ταῦτα. In the first half of the first *hyp.*—and this agrees with the second—, the finite verbs of the main sentences are only aorist indicatives, while the second half offers only present indicatives.[97] There are many predicate participles (circumstantial participles and genitives absolutes) and some used substantively.

The vocabulary is comparable to that in the narrative *hypp.* although the amount of adverbs seems to have increased (cf. e.g. l. 34, 58-59 and 75). However, one important difference should be noticed: the characters are never indicated by their proper names, which may sometimes confuse the reader. Instead of names, we see for example: ἡ ἱερεία, ὁ πρεϲβύτηϲ varied by τοῦ γέροντοϲ, οἰκέτηϲ alternating with τοῦ θεράποντοϲ, γνήϲιοϲ μειρακίϲκοϲ who is the same person as τὸν νεώτερον τῶν γειτόνων (υἱὸν), and τὴν μητέρα once laboriously indicated by τῆϲ ὑποβεβλημένηϲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆϲ instead of which a proper name would have been much clearer. The reason for this omission of names might be partly due to the stock characters which play the main parts in the comedies, e.g. the old man, the lover, and so forth.[98] These indications may replace the proper names. The *index personarum* in one papyrus confirms this pattern: it shows not only the names of the characters but also their 'role', see 27.

27 P.Bodm. 4

The *hyp.* of the *Dyscolus* of Menander is written on the first leaf of a papyrus codex assigned to the end of the third or first half of the fourth century AD.[99] The hand is a practised semi-cursive with a slight slope to the right. High stops are used and apostrophes to indicate elisions. There are some errors, corrections (one in the right margin) and a few abbreviations. Iota adscript is omitted though there is one intrusive example. According to the *ed. pr.*, the codex is neither a luxurious nor a private copy: "On pensera plutôt à un travail exécuté en province, peut-être pour les besoins de l'enseignement." This conclusion gets further support from Blanchard (1991: 211-220) who

---

[97] The reason of this change of tense is obscure and has probably nothing to do with the occurrence of the paragraphus after the first present indicative. The paragraphus is elsewhere only twice used to mark the end of a section, cf. l. 94 and 102.

[98] Cf. e.g. MacCary (1970: 277-290).

[99] For the date of this codex, cf. Nelson-Raymond (1967: 43-48) and Maehler-Cavallo (1987: pl. 5b).

points out that **27** was used by the redactor of the school texts *P.Chester Beatty* (cf. Clarysse-Wouters 1970: 201-235) and *P.Bour.* 1.

The metrical *hyp.* ascribed to Aristophanes the grammarian in its heading (cf. introduction), consists of twelve lines of iambic trimeters. The finite verbs are of the past tense except for one present indicative. In contrast to the second metrical *hyp.* (see **28**), names of characters are mentioned. This *hyp.* summarizes the play inaccurately: several characters (Pan, slaves, cook, Simiche, Callipides) are absent, and the active role of Gorgias is not related. The *hyp.* is followed by didascalic information on its performance (festival, date, victory, principal actor) and on an alternative title; it contains some of the terms used in **26**, 105ff. Thereafter is an *index personarum* providing not only names of characters but also their roles, e.g. *Cίκων μάγειρος*. The remainder of this leaf is left blank. The text of the play starts at the top of the back side.

28 *P.Cair.* inv. 43227

The parts of this papyrus codex are written in a fair-sized hand of the mixed type with a slant to the right. It is assigned to the fourth or fifth century AD. Apostrophes indicate elisions. High stops, diaereses and one abbreviation are employed.

This metrical *hyp.* to Menander's *Heros* also consists of twelve verses, and it is followed by an *index personarum* with names only. There is no reference to Aristophanes, nor is there didascalic information. The text of the play is written immediately after the list of persons. All finite verbs in the *hyp.* are of the past tense. Names are never mentioned.

4.3 Function and readership

The prose *hypp.* to Menander's comedies stem from alphabetically ordered collections, as do the tragic narrative *hypp.* As we have seen above, the narrative *hypp.* lend themselves to be read for their own sakes, that is, independent from the plays. The Menandrean *hypp.*, on the other hand, do not resemble independent narrations: in addition to the heading and summary of the play, which reports the plot and omits the names of characters, they have didascalic information and an appreciation of the play and its characters. These matters suggest that the collection was not meant to be read for its own sake. It may have constituted a kind of reference book offering introductions to

the plays or functioning as a scholar's aid. In any case, they seem to have been less popular than the narrative *hypp.*, at least, if this inference may be drawn from the number of papyri recovered. If true, this may be due to the fact that they do not deal with mythological subjects. In contrast to the mythical contents of the narr. *hypp.*, the information transmitted in the Men. prose *hypp.* is not much use to readers who are not specifically interested in comedy.

In contrast to the prose *hypp.*, the two metric ones are prefixed to the plays they summarize. It is not only this position, but also the lists of the *dramatis personae* and the didascalic information in 27 that point to an introductory function. Although they give the reader an idea of what is going to happen, they do not seem to be composed primarily for the sake of their contents: a clear and more extensive prose summary would have been more suitable for an easily surveyable representation of the plot. The form in which these *hypp.* are written is therefore more important than their contents. The papyri give no indications about their owners or readers except for 27, which seems to have been employed in a school context.

5 Comparative survey of papyri 19-28

This section concentrates on the provenance, date and physical aspects of the papyri. A comparative discussion of their contents and function is given in the conclusions, p. 47ff. Seven papyri stem from Oxyrhynchus; the provenance of 19 is unknown; 27 is perhaps from Panopolis, and 28 is from Aphroditopolis (both Men. codices). In contrast to the narrative *hypp.*, these texts are not written on the back of documents: there are three papyrus codices, the Sophoclean one (19) with several types of *hypp.*, and the two codices which contain plays of Menander to which the metrical *hypp.* 27 and 28 are prefixed. An account has been written on the back of 25 and the backs of the other papyri are blank, as far as I know. The three codices are assigned to the third or fourth century and the other papyri to a date between the first and third century AD.

Three (23, 24, 26) of the four papyri with prose *hypp.* to Menander are quite similar to the narrative *hypp.* inasmuch as they also stem from an alphabetically ordered collection of *hypp.* transmitted separate from the text of the plays. The layout of 25, with the narrow column width and the ornamental heading and first-line quotation written separate from the *hyp.* in a larger script, suggests that this text does

not form part of a larger collection, though it may go back to one. As stated above, 27 and 28, the metrical *hypp.* to Menander, are transmitted together with the text of the plays; it is uncertain whether 19 once contained only several *hypp.* to plays of Sophocles or text of plays as well; the descriptive *hyp.* 22 seems to have been prefixed later to the text of the play; the learned *hypp.* 20 and 21 are marginalia or annotations added to plays of Aeschylus which are written in a larger hand.

All texts are written in practised hands of various size and elegance. The small hands and the regular (20) or frequent (21, 22) use of abbreviations point to the secondary nature of these three texts: they were probably part of working copies written by experienced scribes for the private use of scholars. Occasional abbreviations occur in 27 and 28. Most papyri contain one or more high stops, diaereses, apostrophes or paragraphi. There are no lectional signs in 23 and 25. Apart from 25, all papyri contain itacisms or one or more other errors, though some of them have been corrected. I have not counted letters per line or measured column widths because the number of texts is too small to draw conclusions.

6 Doubtful papyri

The following papyri may contain parts of *hypp.* or have been said to do so, but their status is more doubtful than that of the papyri discussed in the preceding sections. Not only does their actual nature remain obscure, but there is also no certainty about the plays to which these texts should be related.[100]

* *P.Amh.* 2, 17 (*Ed. pr.* B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Amherst Papyri* II, London 1901, 8-9; cf. Pack 446; W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 2.2, 1982, 245-263 with many references to previous discussions) cannot be arranged under one of the groups of *hypp.*, but it shows resemblances to the wording of some *hypp.*: the recto seems to discuss the title and revised edition of an unidentified play, and the main text of the verso consists of iambs preceded by an introductory remark. In the upper

[100] The status of some narrative *hypp.* (cf. e.g. 3, 7 and 11) is also uncertain because the usual heading is not present, but these texts all consist of stories related in Euripidean tragedies. On the problem of identifying fragmentary texts, cf. also p. XVI n. 10.

margin are scholia with the remains πρoλoγo, ιαμβ, and probably a form of ἔπαινοc or ἐπαινέω. The latter reminds one of the appreciations of the play found in the prose *hypp.* of plays of Menander and in the learned *hypp.* of Aristophanes of Byzantium, whereas the interest in the title and prologue recalls the first type of learned *hypp.*, the 'saga-*hypp.*'.

* *P.Oxy.* 49, 3434 (*Ed. pr.* A. Bülow-Jacobsen, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 49, London 1982, 15-16) is discussed by W. Luppe, *APF* 37, 1991, 90 under the heading 'Tragödien-Hypothes(e)is?' but this identification is doubtful: the papyrus preserves line-ends of a prose text which seems to be concerned with a mythographical subject in view of]ἀπὸ Τροι-. The text could be commentary, mythography and much else.

* *P.Giss.Univ.* 4, 41 (*Ed. pr.* H. Eberhart, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* 4, Giessen 1935, 27-28; cf. Pack 1665) might offer, according to Eberhart, a prose summary of a comedy. The text is also included by Austin in *CGFPR* 341 under the heading 'Argumenta Comica', but conclusive evidence on its nature is lacking. The text seems to be concerned with money (cf. περιουcία and χρυcία) and a daughter (θυγα-) but these matters may also occur in a commentary on a comedy, a mythographic text, a fragment from a novel, and so on.

* *P.Berol.* inv. 11673 (*Ed. pr.* W. Schubart, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, Berlin 1950, 26 = p. 55-56; cf. Pack 1694) is included by Austin (*CGFPR* 340) under the same heading as the preceding papyrus since Schubart (*ed. pr.*) suggested that this text summarizes a comedy. I agree with L. Koenen, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 7, who rejects this suggestion: the quotations, among other matters, do not match the usual contents of *hypp.*

7 Conclusions

In this final section, I will summarize the answers to the questions formulated in the Introduction: what kind of information is transmitted in the papyri discussed, and how is this done? How are the contents of the papyri related to other literature? Can we draw conclusions about the function and readership of these texts?

The present chapter has dealt with almost thirty papyri with several types of *hypp.* of tragedies (narrative, learned) and comedies (de-

scriptive and Menandrean prose and metrical *hypp.*). The narrative *hypp.* best represented by eighteen papyri are brief retellings of Euripidean and a few Sophoclean tragedies told in the past tense. Several characteristics revealed by most *hypp.* suggest that they ultimately stem from one single collection written by one author. They may be read perfectly well without the text of the plays or knowledge of them, and they supply information not found in the tragedies when this is needed for understanding the story, for example, genealogical information, names, etc. The *hypp.* are transmitted separately from the plays they retell in collections of *hypp.* ordered alpabetically by playtitle. Both the title and the citation of the first line of the play link the *hyp.* to the play.

In this respect, the narrative *hypp.* find their equivalent in the prose *hypp.* to Menander, which are also transmitted in independent alphabetical collections comprising titles and *incipits*. The main difference between the narrative *hypp.* and the prose *hypp.* to Menander is the presence of didascalic information and an appreciation of the play and its characters in the latter. There is not enough text of the actual *hypp.* preserved for a fair description of its style, which is roughly comparable to that of the narrative *hypp.* One obvious difference is the employment of present and past tenses and the absence of the names of characters.

The one descriptive *hyp.* on papyrus was probably transmitted in front of the text of the play, Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros*. This type of *hyp.* is essentially different from the other types because it is the only *hyp.* which offers an account of a play's contents not isolated from the original dramatic setting; it is a description of a comedy's performance with verbs in the present tense and references to chorus and audience. The other *hypp.* comprise or consist exclusively of accounts of plays' contents: there is no link at all with the original play in the case of the narrative *hypp.*, apart from titles and *incipits*, and the other types of *hypp.* are linked to the original plays merely through the presence of additional material such as didascalic information or an evaluation of the play.[101]

---

[101] In determining the link between plays and *hypp.*, and thereby the function of the *hypp.*, one should place more value on the contents of the *hypp.* than on their actual position because the latter may be due to fortuitous circumstances. The descriptive *hyp.* (20), for example, is probably prefixed to the text of the relevant play, but it may have been derived from an independent collection of *hypp.*

The contents of the learned *hypp.* are primarily known from the med. mss. because the three relevant papyri are rather fragmentary. Instead of retelling the (mythical) events or describing the performance of the play, the learned *hypp.* provide factual and historical knowledge as well as a very brief survey of the contents. Two papyri contain parts of learned *hypp.* pertaining, and written in addition, to plays of Aeschylus; the other learned *hyp.* is found in a papyrus codex with various *hypp.* to Sophocles' tragedies.

The most distinctive feature of the remaining three *hypp.* on papyrus is their form: the contents of the plays are briefly rendered in iambic trimeters. The metrical *hypp.* to Menander are written before the text of the plays in the same hand. Both *hypp.* are accompanied by lists of characters and one by didascalic information as well, but it is doubtful whether these matters belong to the *hypp.* The third metrical *hyp.* is written by a second hand in the Sophocles codex among other types of *hypp.*

So much for the issues of contents and transmission. I will now summarize their connections with ancient scholarship and some mythographic works. The alphabetic order and the *incipits* used in the narrative *hypp.* and prose *hypp.* to Menander seem to go back to Peripatetic and Alexandrian scholarship (cf. §1.1 and n. 6 and 8). *Incipits* used to identify works occur in Aristotle's writings and in Callimachus' *Pinakes*, which contain alphabetical lists of authors and their writings.[102] Apart from the *Pinakes*, Callimachus composed chronological tables of the Attic dramatists presumably based on Aristotle's διδασκαλίαι.[103] Both types of learned *hypp.* contain information probably derived from these scholarly treatises (cf. p. 32ff.). In addition, the *hypp.* to Menander also contain didascalic information.[104]

The names of several scholars have frequently been connected with the *hypp.*: Aristophanes of Byzantium is generally accepted as the author of part of the learned *hypp.*; both the narrative *hypp.* and the

[102] Cf. Daly (1967: 25): "While one cannot say that Callimachus, or any other identifiable individual, was the originator of the principle of alphabetic arrangement, it is a reasonable and attractive hypothesis that the principle was first put to effective use by the scholars of Alexandria in response to the problems they faced as a result of the accumulation under their supervision of such an unprecedented mountain of literature and information."

[103] Cf. Arist. fr. 621 ed. Rose (1967), and on Aristotle's *Didascaliae* in general, Blum (1977: 50ff.).

[104] The descriptive *hyp.* concludes with an explanatory note, at which point the med. *hypp.* of this type provide didascalic information, cf. p. 38.

other part of the learned *hypp.* have been attributed by different scholars to Dicaearchus of Messene, a pupil of Aristotle. The precise relationship with the *hypp.* mentioned is still a matter of dispute (cf. p. 3 and 32, esp. n. 78). The same holds true for the attribution of the descriptive *hyp.* to Symmachus, the Menandrean prose *hypp.* to Homerus Sellius, and the metrical *hypp.* to Aristophanes of Byzantium. The papyri do not provide new evidence for this problem.[105] In short, there appear to be only two certain connections between the dramatic *hypp.* and scholarship: first, part of the *hypp.* contains learned information and, second, the organization of the material reflects a scholarly tradition.

Most types of *hypp.* cannot be linked with other literature: they only appear in the context of the plays on which they are based. The narrative *hypp.*, on the other hand, lend themselves to comparisons with the works of Apd. and Hyg. owing to their focus on the mythical contents of the tragedies. The correspondences between the narrative *hypp.* and Apd. and Hyg. appear to be restricted to similar subjects and small verbal agreements. They do not seem to indicate a direct link between the writings, though parts of Apd. and Hyg. may go back in the last resort to *hypp.* The nature of the narrative *hypp.* is quite different from that of Apd. and Hyg.: the unity of the contents and the link with the underlying tragedies has no equivalent in the comprehensive writings of the mythographers. The stories in Apd. form part of a continuous text arranged genealogically and the stories in Hyg. occur at least partly in a thematic or genealogical context.

The last point of interest concerns the function and readership of these texts. The contents of both the descriptive *hyp.* and the learned *hypp.* suggest a close link with the plays: the former visualizes the performance of the play, and the latter supply historical information in addition to remarks on the tragedies' contents. These *hypp.* were not written for entertainment but for the benefit of future readers of the plays or of other people interested in the information provided about the plays. This introductory, auxiliary or subsidiary function for 20-22 is further demonstrated by the position of the *hypp.*, the typology of the hands and the use of abbreviations—matters which at the same

---

[105] Not every scholar is convinced of Aristophanes' authorship of the metrical *hypp.* to Menander even though the *hyp.* in 27 is ascribed to him. Cf. p. 41 and n. 95.

time suggest that these texts may be scholars' copies.[106] The metrical *hypp.* are perhaps more ornamental than useful as introductions, apart from the accompanying didascalic information in one of them and the lists of characters. Whereas 20-22 may have been used by scholars and 27 seems to originate in a school milieu, we do not know the social context of 19 or 28.

As far as the narrative *hypp.* and prose *hypp.* to Menander are concerned, the format of the papyrus texts and the typology of the hands do not give clues to their function and readership apart from the few school texts (cf. conclusions p. 161). In addition to an extensive[107] account of the contents, the Men. prose *hypp.* contain didascalic information and an appreciation of the play, which may point to an introductory or auxiliary function, as in the case of the descriptive and learned *hypp.* It is nevertheless obvious that these three types concentrate on different matters. The function of the narrative *hypp.* is more difficult to determine as their retellings are not accompanied by other information. Yet the alphabetical organization and use of *incipits* is the same as in the prose *hypp.* to Menander. We should ask ourselves whether this agreement is meaningful for conclusions that may be drawn about the purpose and function of the narrative *hypp.* If the answer is negative, it follows that both types of *hypp.* may have been written for different purposes and may have functioned differently. But if the answer is affirmative,[108] then it may be concluded that the original purpose of the narrative *hypp.* was similar to that of the prose *hypp.* to Men. This would mean that the collection of narrative *hypp.* was written not to replace the plays but in addition to them.[109]

---

[106] On the uncertain state of 19 see commentary.

[107] These accounts are quite extensive because the contents of comedies are less established than the course of events in tragedies.

[108] I prefer this option in view of the presence of *incipits*: they would have been superfluous in a collection that was meant to be read instead of the tragedies themselves.

[109] This is quite the opposite of the most current view: cf. Zuntz (1955: 135) "Their sole purpose is to summarise the action of the play. (...) These arguments are not designed to introduce the reader to the plays. They are meant as a substitute for the plays." and 141-142 "The hypotheseis of the second type represented, from their origin, the very kind of material which would be welcomed by an age bent upon rehearsing the traditions of the productive past." and Turner (1968: 101), who characterizes the collection as "... a work of popularization retelling the story of the plays in digest form, so that the reader could skip the original if he felt so inclined." See also Rusten (1982: 358).

The collection would thus have had an auxiliary function.[110] But whatever the original aim and function of the narrative *hypp.* may have been, it appeared in §1.7 that the narrative *hypp.* have served different purposes over the course of time. They do not only appear in more contexts than the other types of *hypp.*, but they also survive in a greater number of papyri. It is reasonable to conclude that both the mythical contents and the style of the work generated this greater popularity.[111]

To sum up, all types of *hypp.* seem to have been written in addition to the texts of the plays, but we cannot exclude the possibility that the narrative *hypp.* formed a convenient collection which enabled certain readers to obtain the desired knowledge without having to consult or read the original tragedies.

---

[110] Cf. Haslam (1994: 211), who describes the collection's character as follows: "As a reliable and comprehensive scholarly subsidium, rigorously excluding everything but the exposition of each play's *μῦθοϲ* (in contrast with the later Alexandrian 'hypotheses'), it bears comparison with Aristotle's own *Didaskaliai*, and in tandem with the chronological data of the didaskaliai it would have provided a good basis for comparative investigations into the tragedians' mythopoeia."

[111] A comparable difference appears between the number of Sophoclean and Euripidean *hypp.* Euripides' popularity may account for this divergence. I refrain from drawing further conclusions about popularity or similar matters based on the numbers of papyri for the following reasons: first, the number of subliterary papyri is too small for sound statistical inferences. Second, papyri containing poetic texts are easier to identify and attract more attention than subliterary papyri with prose texts, which means that the former are published sooner than the subliterary papyri. The precise proportions between the groups may change in the course of future research. Compare for instance the papyri with mythical catalogues in ch. 4: six of the seventeen have been published in two recent volumes of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. For comparative surveys on the numbers of literary papyri, cf. e.g. Montevecchi (1973: 360-363), Wouters (1975: 16-17) and Krüger (1990: 214ff.).

CHAPTER TWO

HOMERIC HYPOTHESES AND CALLIMACHEAN DIEGESES

The first part of this chapter is devoted to papyri with *hypp.* of *Il.* and *Od.*, whereas the second part is concerned with Callimachean *diegeses* on papyrus. Both the *hypp.* and the *diegeses* are a kind of summary written in prose and preceded by the quotation of the first line of the poetry summarized. Further similarities or differences will become clear in the course of this chapter.

1 Homeric hypotheses

Some general characteristics of the Homeric *hypp.* are mentioned in §1.1 Introduction, which is followed by a discussion of each papyrus and a comparative survey of matters as provenance, date, writing material, layout and lectional signs. The last three sections deal with the Homeric *hypp.* in the med. mss., other Homeric summaries, and the questions of function and readership.

1.1 Introduction

It is now customary to designate summaries of books of the *Il.* and *Od.* with the term '*hypotheses*'. This terminology is probably adopted from the med. mss. because not one *hyp.* is thus introduced in the papyri.[1] As we have seen in Chapter One, the expression *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ* usually precedes the summaries of the narrative *hypp.* and the prose *hypp.* to plays of Menander. These dramatic *hypp.* are also comparable to the majority of the Homeric *hypp.*, though the differences outweigh the similarities, as will appear on the following pages.

To start with the headings, the only instances present in the Homeric *hypp.* consist of indications of the books summarized. The most common form is *τῆϲ* plus the letter of the book, for instance '*τῆϲ α*'

[1] *ἡ ἐξ ἀρχῆϲ ὑπόθεϲιϲ* in 30, 8 introduces the *antehomerica*.

(cf. **35**, **36**, **41** and **42**),[2] but we also find only the letter: cf. 'ᾱ' in **29** (see also **38**) and '*θῆτα*' in **34**.[3] The indication of the book is usually followed by the citation of the first line of the book and the actual *hyp.* or summary which reports the main events.

Because the summaries themselves show great differences in length and style, I have distinguished the following three types: discourse, nominal and hybrid *hypp.* The greater part of the papyri contain discourse *hypp.* They are referred to in this way because they are short prose accounts of the contents of the *Il.* and *Od.* written in direct discourse. In most *hypp.* (**32**, **33**, **35**, **37-42**), the finite verbs of the main sentences are indicatives in the present tense. **34** and **36** have finite verbs of both present and past tense although present indicatives predominate. Only the *hypp.* to *Il.* 1 (**29-31**) have exclusively aorist indicatives.[4] In view of current theories on the use of tenses (cf. p. 8 n. 23), the exclusive use of the aorist might signify that we are not dealing with a synopsis but with a retelling (on this issue, cf. p. 73).

Most discourse *hypp.* do not contain many adverbs, adjectives, negations or pronouns.[5] This also applies to the nominal and hybrid *hypp.* The nominal *hyp.* enumerates the main events of a book with the help of substantives accompanied by several adjuncts, for instance, participles. When the main clause contains a finite verb, the *hyp.* is not called nominal anymore. Exceptions are made for the verb *γίνεται* surrounded by substantives and for verbs like *περιέχει* which refer to the Homeric text and on which substantives in the accusative depend.[6] The nominal *hyp.* is more like chapter headings, titles or indexes[7] than the discourse *hypp.*, which are far longer: **29** with a *hyp.*

---

[2] *τῆϲ α* is probably a short indication for something like (*ὑπόθεϲιϲ*) *τῆϲ α* (*ῥαψῳδίαϲ*). The same indications occur in MH **51** and **53** and cf. the glossaries *P.Colon.* inv. 2381 and *P.Berol.* inv. 11634.

[3] The indications of the books in **39** are uncertain, cf. commentary and text.

[4] Since several texts are very small and thus preserve only a few finite verbs, we might get a slightly distorted picture. On the other hand, the occurrence of tenses in the med. *hypp.* agrees with that in the papyrus *hypp.*

[5] These parts of speech will not be commented upon in the discussion of the individual papyri unless there appears something noteworthy.

[6] See, for example, the first part of the *hyp.* in med. ms. K to *Od.* 11: *τὴν εἰϲ Ἅιδου ἄφιξιν Ὀδυϲϲέωϲ περιέχει καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ γενομένην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ θυϲίαν* (the complete *hyp.* is of the hybrid type).

[7] Cf. p. 33, part d of the learned *hypp.* of Aristophanes of Byzantium (see e.g. the med. *hypp.* to S. *OT* III, *Ant.* I; A. *Th.*; E. *Ph.*), and the papyri with 'tables of contents' mentioned on p. 73; see also Stanzel (1979: 39-67 = Ch. 2 "Nullstufen der Mittelbarkeit: Synopse, Kapitelüberschrift, Entwurf", but esp. 58); or in the

of *Il.* 1 containing 611 verses, for example, counts hundred words against nineteen words in 36 regarding the *hyp.* of *Il.* 14 containing 522 verses. 36 is actually the only papyrus with nominal *hypp.* but the med. mss. contain some examples as well (cf. p. 68).

The hybrid *hyp.* is a mixture of the previous two types and occurs in 36 and 40 (for med. *hypp.*, cf. p. 68). As there occur considerable differences even within the types distinguished, the contents of each papyrus will be discussed separately.

1.2 Papyri[8]

29 *P.Achm.* 2

The text is written on a leaf of a papyrus codex in a regular hand assigned to the third or fourth century AD. The back is blank. There are no lectional signs except for some diaereses, and in the part not printed, one high stop and one apostrophe. Some orthographic errors appear and one correction. Iota adscript is omitted and the word *θεός* (cf. l. 8, 12, 19) is abbreviated as usual in Christian writings. Twenty-eight to forty letters are written per line.

The text starts with the letter ᾱ to indicate the first book and a citation of the first line, and is followed by the complete *hyp.* of *Il.* 1, the sentence Περιέχει δὲ ἡ ῥαψῳδία ἡμέρας κα,[9] and a glossary to *Il.* 1, 1-21 resembling the D-scholia. In general, this *hyp.*, which includes exactly hundred words, follows the line of contents as told in *Il.* 1.

English translation (1984: 22-45 = Ch. 2 "Zero grades of mediacy: synopsis, chapter heading, outline").

[8] The papyri are ordered in view of the books which they summarize (not per type) because one papyrus may contain different types of *hypp.* The discussion of each papyrus consists of a description of the physical aspects and of the contents, which are briefly compared with the med. *hypp.* For the indications I, II and i, ii, etc. and for the editions used for quotations of the med. *hypp.*, cf. below n. 30, 31.

[9] Cf. *περιέχει* in 40, where more references are given. The number of days of the first book of the *Il.* was a point of discussion between Aristarchus, who counted twenty-one days, and Zenodotus, who counted twenty days. An extract from Zenodotus' arguments occurs probably on *Tabula Iliaca* 8E, see Sadurska (1964: 54). Cf. sch. *Il.* 2, 48 (Ddf. I) *πρὸς τὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀριθμόν, ὅτι τρίτη καὶ εἰκοστή· δέκα μὲν μέχρι τῆς μήνιδος, δώδεκα τῶν θεῶν ἐν Αἰθιοπίαι ὄντων. ἡ δὲ ἀνατολὴ αὕτη τρίτη καὶ εἰκοστή ἐστιν.* See also *P.Berol.* inv. 9571 recto, a papyrus with a discussion on the days of the *Od.*; *ed. pr.* by Schubart (1950: no. 3) and reprinted with some changes by Merkelbach (1956: 118-119).

The chronological order is not observed in ll. 11-13 which first relate that Agamemnon gives Chryseis back and sacrifices to Zeus (*Il.* 1, 430-487) and then that he takes Briseis away from Achilles (*Il.* 1, 320-348). This may be due to the deliberate arrangement of the clauses with *μέν-μέν-δέ-δέ*.

The *hyp.* is composed of single and compound sentences (with one temporal and one final clause) which are linked by *διόπερ*, *καί*, *δέ* and *μέν-δέ*. Once a double *μέν-δέ* structure (*μέν-μέν-δέ-δέ*) occurs. The nine finite verbs are all aorist indicatives. We further see four circumstantial participles, three genitives absolutes and several adverb(ial expression)s. It seems as if special attention has been paid to the word order: the genitive absolutes are positioned at the ends of clauses and the word order in the following phrases is also remarkable: ... *οὐκ ἀπέδωκεν δεομένῳ λυτρώcαcθαι τῷ πατρί*; ... *τὴν δὲ ᾽Αχιλλέωc ἀφείλατο Βριcηῖδα* and ... *τῆc μητρὸc ἐδεήθη Θέτιδοc*. Whereas the separation of words naturally belonging together is a common phenomenon in late Hellenistic prose, these are the only instances found in the Homeric *hypp.* on papyrus.[10]

There is only one *hyp.* to *Il.* 1 in the med. mss., which is about fifteen words longer than the papyrus text and almost entirely different. The med. *hyp.* shows a mixture of present and aorist indicatives.

30 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3829

This text is written across the fibres in a thick, clumsy, semi-literary hand, approximately bilinear with occasional ornament in the form of right-pointing curls or ticks on the feet of uprights. The papyrus is assigned to the later second century AD in view of these features and the cursive documents on the front. There are diaereses, some stops and paragraphi, and letters which were badly written were corrected by the scribe himself. There are many itacistic errors and iota adscript is omitted. Lines contain between nineteen and thirty letters.

This papyrus contains the end of a catechism on characters of the *Il.*, a narrative of *antehomerica* and the first line of *Il.* 1 plus the beginning of a *hyp.*[11] Since this seems to preserve the same text as the

[10] On this phenomenon, cf. Palm (1955: 131) and p. 8 regarding the narrative *hypp.* See also the med. Homeric *hypp.* 9II, 12II, 14II and 17I.

[11] A similar catechism occurs in the med. cod. R (see the description in Schimberg 1890: 423-427) and in the school texts *PSI* 1, 19 and *P.IFAO* inv. 320, cf. Marrou (1948: 233) and Cribiore (1996: no. 405-406). The second pap. also contains *antehomerica*.

hyp. in 29, it will not be discussed. Both the hand and the catechism (cf. n. 11) suggest that this papyrus is a school text.

31 *P.Bon.* 1, 6

The text of this small papyrus fragment is written along the fibres in a small column between two vertical lines. Lines have ca. thirteen letters. The back is blank. The uncertain, irregular and clumsy hand is assigned to the third or fourth century AD.

The text relates the contents of *Il.* 1, ±26-73 and the first sentence is comparable to the following part of the med. *hyp.*: ... *ἀποδιωχθεὶϲ ηὔξατο τῶι* 'Απόλλωνι ... Since our papyrus has not preserved the beginning of this text, we do not know if it contained the usual indication of the book and the citation of the first line.[12] The three finite verbs are aorist indicatives and there are three circumstantial participles and one relative clause. The reading of lines 5 and 6 and the transitive use of the verb *ἐπιϲκήπτω* present some difficulty. In view of this and of the 'evolving' hand, Cribiore (1996: no. 352) thinks this text is probably an original summary made by a student.

32 *P.Pis.* inv. 1

This papyrus fragment has a documentary text on one side and the Homeric text on the other side, both written along the fibres. The hand of the Homeric text is large, inclines to the right, and is assigned to the sixth century AD. According to Cribiore (1996: no. 356), the hand is that of an advanced student or a teacher. *ν* at the end of the line is abbreviated. The lines have about thirty letters.

The text seems to be the end of a *hyp.* of *Il.* 3 followed by one blank line and an *ἐπιγραφή*. The scanty remains of our text (ll. 1-4) show some resemblance to part of the long med. *hyp.* (II), cf. *καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην τρέπονται,* 'Αγαμέμνων *δὲ κατὰ τοὺϲ ὅρκουϲ ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν* 'Ελένην ... The only verbs in the papyrus are two present indicatives.

The epigraph (l. 5) is comparable to the end of the following headings: cod. Paris. 2690 Γ *ὅρκοι. τειχοϲκοπία.* Πάριδοϲ *καὶ* Μενελάου *μονομαχία.*; Eust. *ὅρκοι. μονομαχία* 'Αλεξάνδρου *καὶ* Μενελάου. Mon-

[12] For the attribution of 31 and 32 to the corpus of Homeric *hypp.* and a comparison with the D-scholia, see Montanari (1982 *Anag.*: 273-284 = 1995 *Studi*: 87-95).

tanari interprets the stroke after *μονομαχία* as the abbreviation of the final *ν*, which provides him with a problematic accusative. He offers several possible explanations,[13] but it seems more reasonable to suggest that the horizontal dash, which is written after not above the alpha—cf. l. 2 where the stroke is placed above the omega—is simply a kind of marker or decorative stroke instead of a final *ν*.[14]

33 *P.Oxy.* 44, 3159

The two columns of this fragment are written on the back of some accounts in an ungainly third-century hand with cursive forms and ligatures. No lectional signs occur apart from some diaereses. There are several phonetic errors in the second column (not printed) and about nineteen letters per line.

The upper part of the first column contains the end of a *hyp.* to *Il.* 7 summarizing l. 442ff. whereas the lower part, about 7 cm, is left empty. The glossary to the same book starts in the second column. The writing in this column is slightly different from that in the first. As Cribiore (1996: no. 336) remarks, "it is possible that the hand of the second col. is different or that the exercise was done at a different time."

Concerning the *hyp.*, there are probably two present tense indicatives and two circumstantial participles. The concluding words [*τὰ πά*]*θη τοῦ πολέμου* [*προδείκν*]*υςιν* are comparable to the following sentence from the med. *hyp.* I whereas *hyp.* II, the more extensive one, has nothing in common: *Ζεὺϲ τε αὐτοῖϲ διὰ νυκτὸϲ ϲημεῖα οὐκ αἴϲια τῶν μελλόντων δείκνυϲιν*. The agreement in their interpretation is remarkable because it is not self-evident to summarize 478-479 *παννύχιοϲ δέ ϲφιν κακὰ μήδετο μητίετα Ζεὺϲ ϲμερδαλέα κτυπέων* in this way.

34 *P.Mich.* inv. 920a,b + 921

These fragments are written on the back of official accounts across the fibres in a regular but rapidly written capital slanting to the right and assigned to the second or third century AD. Upper and lower

---

13 Cf. Montanari (1982: 277). In view of his suggestion that the accusative might depend on "*τὸ* Γ *περιέχει* o simile (cfr. Allen, *loc. cit.*, sulla base di Sch. *Dionys. Thrac.* 28,17 sgg. Hilgard, *GG* I 3)", one may also compare the accusatives found in the med. *hypp.* to *Od.* 22ii and 24i.

14 The fact that decorative strokes that accompany titles are usually written not only above but also below the titles speaks against this idea, cf. e.g. *GMAW* 14, 50; *P.Oxy.* 5, 843; 8, 1082; 9, 1176; 11, 1399.

margins are ca. 3.2 cm and some thirty letters are written per line. There are no lectional signs and iota adscript is written only with omega. There is one correction.

The *hypp.* of *Il.* 7 and 8, which are partly preserved, are remarkable for two reasons. First, they cite not only the first line of each book, but also the last line. Second, they appear to focus exclusively on the acts of human persons. This happens in a rather detailed manner, as for instance the enumeration of men in ll. 5-8[15] and cf. ll. 16-18 which adopt almost verbally the Homeric text: cf. *Il.* 7, 467 *νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέcταcαν οἶνον ἄγουcαι* and 472 *ἔνθεν* (*ἄρ'*) *οἰνίζοντο κάρη κομόωντες* 'Ἀχαιοί. The gods, on the contrary, go unmentioned even though they play an important role in book 8.[16]

The *hyp.* to *Il.* 7 does not resemble the one in 33, but it shows several agreements with the med. *hyp.* I, although the latter is far shorter, cf. *προκαλεῖται τῶν* 'Ἑλλήνων *τὸν ἄριcτον εἰc μονομαχίαν. ἐννέα δὲ ἀναcτάντων ἔλαχεν* Αἴαc *ὁ* Τελαμώνιοc, *καὶ γενναίωc αὐτοὺc ἀγωνιcαμένουc διαλύουcι κήρυκεc ἑcπέραc γενομένηc. τῆι δ' ἑξῆc τοὺc νεκροὺc ἀνελόμενοι θάπτουcι, καὶ τεῖχοc οἱ* Ἕλληνεc *καταcκευάζουcιν* ... *Hyp.* II has some parallel wording, but is for the most part different. Neither of the med. *hypp.* enumerates the Greek heroes (ll. 5-8) or concludes with the arrival of the ships and the buying of wine (ll. 16-18).

As for the *hyp.* to *Il.* 8, there is almost no agreement with the med. *hypp.* which are mainly concerned with the actions of the gods contrary to our *hyp.* Only the endings of the three *hypp.*—Hector and the other Trojans stay overnight near the ships and burn fires—show some slight resemblances.

The text consists of many short sentences connected by *δέ*, *καί* and *τε*. Both *hypp.* contain a relative clause. The finite verbs of the main sentences are primarily indicatives of present tense, and there occur some aorist indicatives. As far as vocabulary is concerned, some variation is seen: Greeks are first indicated by 'Ἑλλήνων, then by 'Ἀχαιοί, and Trojans are called both Τρώων and *βάρβαροι*. Finally, the following observations can be made on lines:

11. If the supplement of [*νι*]*κᾷ* in l. 11 is correct, the text would closely agree with the variant in cod. Lips. Gr. 32, quoted by O'Hara

---

[15] Cf. the list of men killed by Patroclus in *P.Köln* 4, 180, a rough paraphrase of *Il.* 16, 394ff.

[16] This leaps to the eye when one compares this *hyp.* to the med. *hypp.* of *Il.* 8. In Apd. *Epit.* 4, 1ff. and the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* gods are absent too (cf. p. 70).

in the *ed. pr.* p. 2: καὶ ἀντιςτὰς νικᾶι (subject is Ajax) τὸν Ἕκτορα· διαλύουςι δὲ αὐτοὺς οἱ κήρυκες. This text and that of our *hyp.*—Ajax wins and the heralds stop the fight—may seem strange but Ajax has already wounded Hector when the heralds intervene. In the eyes of the Greek, Ajax is the victor.[17] The version of cod. Paris. 2690 (7I) summarizes Homer more freely and is therefore less confusing: ... καὶ γενναίως αὐτοὺς ἀγωνιςαμένους διαλύουςι κήρυκες.

13-15. The contents of l. 15 belong before l. 13-14; the Iliadic order of events is as follows: *Il.* 282 night ends duel; 381 at the first appearance of dawn Idaeus negotiates about a truce; 421 some time later, both parties start gathering and cremating their dead, and 433 the mound and wall are built.[18]

17-18. Whatever one reads, εἰς [τὸ] ἀγοράςαι. Ἀχαιοὶ οἰνίζονται· (paleographically preferable) or εἰς ἀγοράς· οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ οἰνίζονται, the phrasing is somewhat awkward. In the first case because Ἀχαιοὶ οἰνίζονται follows ἀγοράςαι without a particle (and article). In the second case because εἰς ἀγοράς (asyndetically) follows εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον. Could ἀγοράςαι have been some kind of explanation of οἰνίζονται which slipped into the text?[19]

35 *P.Oxy.* 3, 574

This text is written on the back of a documentary text in a semi-uncial hand assigned to the second century AD. There are several errors, one correction and no lectional signs. The lines are about thirty-four letters long.

This fragment contains an indication of book 12 preceded by the end of a *hyp.* to *Il.* 11 (±608ff.), which partly agrees with the *hypp.* in the med. scholia. The phrase Πάτροκλον μαθηςόμενον τίς εἴη occurs in several med. *hypp.* and ςυναντᾷ Εὐρυπύλῳ and ἰᾶται occur in one med. *hyp.*[20] We further see a relative clause, two present indicatives and the conjunction δέ. Line 2 ἀπολυόμενος τῆς παρατάξεως now refers to Patroclus, but he does not come from the line of battle in contrast to Eurypylus, cf. *Il.* 11, 811 ςκάζων ἐκ πολέμου. Perhaps ἀπολυομένῳ should be read.

[17] Cf. Kirk (1990) on *Il.* 7, 311-312 Αἴαντ' ... κεχαρηότα νίκηι.

[18] On the problem whether all events take place on one or two days, cf. *ed. pr.* and Kirk (1990: 286-287).

[19] Cf. Suda οἰνίζω and οἰνιςάμενοι which are paraphrased by οἶνον ἀγοράζω and οἶνον ἀγοράςαντες.

[20] For a discussion of these *hypp.*, cf. Montanari (1982 *ZPE*: 90).

36 *P.Mich.* inv. 1315

The text is written on the back of a document in an experienced hand assigned to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century AD. The only lectional signs are some diaereses. There are many orthographic errors, some of them corrected. The lines carry thirty to thirty-nine letters.

This papyrus contains *hypp.* to *Il.* 10-17. The two that summarize *Il.* 13 and 14 (see ll. 28-35) are nominal *hypp.*, which have nothing in common with the med. *hypp.* Since the substantive (nom.) is often preceded by the name of a person in the genitive, and followed by other adjuncts, for instance a genitive absolute, they are more extensive than the *ἐπιγραφαί* to *Il.* 13 and 14 in the med. mss. (cf. cod. Paris. 2690: 13 *μάχη ἐπὶ ταῖς ναυςίν* and 14 *Διὸς ἀπάτη*).

The *hypp.* of *Il.* 15-17 are hybrid *hypp.* because they start as nominal and end as discourse *hypp.* These *hypp.* sometimes show wording comparable to the med. *hypp.*, cf. e.g. *hyp.* 17I *περὶ τοῦ Πατρόκλου ςώματος κρατερὰ ςυνίςταται μάχη, καθ' ἣν Εὔφορβος μὲν ἀναιρεῖται ὑπὸ Μενελάου* ... The remains of *hypp.* 10-12 are too scanty to characterize them but they seem to show a similar combination of substantives and prose accounts.

In *hyp.* 10 we see one aorist and one present indicative, in 12 one present indicative, in 15 one aorist, and in 16 and 17 present indicatives. A relative clause occurs in 10 and 17, and a final clause in 16, which also has various conjunctions: *ἀλλὰ καί*, *μὲν οὖν-αὖθις δ'*, *μέν-μέν δέ*. Elsewhere we find *καί*, *γάρ* and *τε*.

37 *JHS* 28, 1908, 129 XII, XIII (+ 43, 1923, 42-43)

Three fragments of an ostracon preserve part of a school text written in an irregular round hand assigned to the second century AD. There are some high stops, diaereses and several errors. About twenty-five letters are written per line.

The text consists of part of a summary of *Il.* 20. Ll. 5-9 summarize *Il.* 20, 33-40 where the gods who favoured the Greek and the Trojan army are enumerated. The ostracon presents a reversed order—first Trojans, then Greek—while the med. *hypp.* follow the Homeric text. The preceding lines probably reproduce *Il.* 20, 1-32: Zeus permits the gods to support whomever they want. On ll. 14-15, cf. part of Ps.-

Dositheus' summary of *Il.* 20:[21] *τότε οὖν Ἀπόλλων μεταμορφωθεὶς εἰς Λυκάονα πείθει Αἰνείαν, ἵνα κατέναντι Ἀχιλλέως πυκτεύσῃ· κἀκεῖνος πεισθεὶς* ... Our text seems to be more extensive than the med. *hyp.*; it is uncertain whether it stems from a *hyp.* or rather a kind of paraphrase of *Il.* 20. All finite verbs are in the present tense.

38 *P.Ant.* 2, 69

The text is written on both sides of a papyrus fragment, perhaps part of a codex (cf. Turner 1977: 206a n. 18), of fair quality in a regular rounded upright hand assigned to the second or early third century AD. There are between thirty-one and thirty-eight letters per line. The scanty remains contain no lectional signs or errors.

The front offers the end of a *hyp.* to *Il.* 22 (±238ff.) which has some resemblance to the med. *hyp.* I, cf. *Ἀθηνᾶς αὐτὸν πεισάσης, καὶ ἀναιρεῖται. ἐξάψας δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ ἅρματος ... οἱ δὲ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν.* Hereafter we see the indication and first line of book 23. The other side presents the first line and *hyp.* of *Od.* 2 and the indication and first line of *Od.* 3. Lines 10-11 resemble the med. *hypp.* of *Od.* 2: i *συναγαγὼν ἐκκλησίαν Τηλέμαχος παραγγέλλει τοῖς μνηστῆρσιν ἐξιέναι τῆς οἰκίας τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως*; and ii *ἅμα ἕω Τηλέμαχος συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἰθακησίους κελεύει τοὺς μνηστῆρας ἀπαλλάττεσθαι τῆς οἰκίας*, but the second half has nothing in common. All finite verbs are in the present tense and some conjunctions occur: *δέ* and *καί* (*οὕτως*).[22] The sentences seem to be short, but this might be due to the smallness of the remains.

39 *P.Oxy.* 44, 3160 + *P.Stras.* gr. 1401

These papyrus fragments stem from one roll. The text is written on the back of a register in an informal, fast but hardly cursive hand of around the first half of the third century AD. There are several errors, both in spelling and in syntax. Paragraphi, diaeresis and apostrophe are used. The lines carry between twenty and twenty-seven letters.

The text consists of parts of a glossary to *Od.* 1, a complete *hyp.* to *Od.* 2 followed by a glossary to the same book and a fragmentary

[21] Cited from Jahn-Michaelis (1873: 109).

[22] *καὶ οὕτω(ς)* occurs quite often in the med. *hypp.*: cf. e.g. *Il.* 4II, 14II, 15II, 18II, 21II, 22II, 23I and 24II.

hyp. to *Od.* 3. The form of the transitions between the glossaries and the citations of the first lines is not clear. In both cases, there is a kind of paragraphus below the citation, and above it (that is, to the left of the preceding lines) are some vertical traces with a horizontal stroke on top of them. Haslam (*ed. pr.*) interpreted these traces as the indications of the books, resp. *β* and *γ*, written in the margin. Luppe regards them as the enlarged first letters of *δευτέρα* and *τρ(ε)ίτῃ*. Regarding the latter, Haslam's *π*- (cf. l. 21) seems preferable to *τρ*-.

The *hyp.* to *Od.* 2 has been divided by Montanari (1981: 103ff.) into three sections: A. ll. 3-6 (*ἅμα-αὐτοῦ*), B. ll. 7-17 (*μὴ-βούλεται*) and C. ll. 17-20 (*διαcκωφθεὶc-ἀποπλεῖ*). He points out that the first and last section are also found in the two *hypp.* in the med. scholia (cf. text cited at 38), but that section B is not present in *hyp.* i and is rapidly summarized in *hyp.* ii. This second section of the papyrus is actually a sort of paraphrase of *Od.* 2, 214-223, in which Telemachus announces that he will go to Sparta and Pylos to get information on his father and what action he will take depending on the message he gets. Some elements have been added to this paraphrase from other parts of this book. In view of ll. 14-17 *βούλεται*, Montanari rightly compares *Od.* 2, 52-54 and 133. This second section is also remarkable for another reason: instead of a grammatically correct text stating Telemachus' words on his future actions, we see a mixture of direct discourse and indirect speech, as if a verb of saying preceded it.[23] *μὴ πειcθέντων* (sc. *μνηcτήρων* or more broadly *'Ιθακηcίων*) *δὲ ἀποπλεῖ* is more or less repeated by *διαcκωφθεὶc δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μνηcτήρων ... ἀποπλεῖ*. So, in view of all these peculiarities of the second section, we may conclude that the present text might go back to a *hyp.* which only comprised section A and C, to which the scribe of this text has added section B.[24] If one discards these lines, the remaining text runs more smoothly and is perfectly understandable and comparable to *hyp.* i of the scholia.

Although the *hyp.* of *Od.* 3 is only partly preserved, it is clear that the beginning, ll. 24-29, about Telemachus' and Athena's arrival in Pylos (= *Od.* 3, 1-66) resembles the beginning of the med. *hypp.*, cf. i *Τηλέμαχοc εἰc Πύλον καταχθεὶc ἅμα τῆι 'Αθηνᾶι ἐν Μέντοροc μορ-*

[23] Cf. *ed. pr.* 56; Luppe (1977: 104-105); Montanari (1981: 103).

[24] The scribe might have been a pupil who had to elaborate the original *hyp.*; cf. *ed. pr.* 52, "The work is an elementary one, evidently a product of the schoolroom: perhaps a pupil's copy of his master's creation".

φῆι καταλαμβάνει τοὺς Πυλίους θυςίαν ταύρων ἐπιτελοῦντας τῶι Ποςειδῶνι· Ll. 29-end summarize *Od.* 67-328. Ll. 29-31 probably record that Telemachus asks Nestor about his father and from l. 31 or 32 onwards, the papyrus extensively relates the answer of Nestor found in *Od.* 3, 317-326. We might be dealing again with a kind of amplification since this part is not represented in the med. *hypp.*

As for its syntax, section A and C of the *hyp.* to *Od.* 2 both consist of one single sentence with nominative participles and a gen. absolute. Section B comprises a compound sentence with all types of predicate participles, two conditional clauses within a *μέν-δέ* structure, one final and one relative clause. The finite verbs of the main sentences (in all sections) are present indicatives, and in the subordinate clauses (section B) we see an optative and after ὅπως a future indicative instead of a subjunctive. See also the remarks above on the second sentence. The *hyp.* of *Od.* 3 has present indicatives, but there is too much lost to say more.

40 *P.Ryl.* 1, 23

This papyrus fragment contains the ends of two columns of text written in a round upright uncial from about the middle of the second century AD. The back is blank. There is one stop, a rough breathing, and a later addition of the word Athena at the end of line 11. Lines typically have twenty-one to twenty-four letters.

The second *hyp.* in this papyrus can be called hybrid because it is a mixture of a discourse sentence and of substantives. The *hyp.* of *Od.* 6 starts after the quotation of l. 1 with περιέχει ὡς followed by a prose sentence and a substantive in the accusative plus adjuncts.[25] It is not improbable that a similar introduction should be supplemented at the beginning of what is left of the *hyp.* to *Od.* 3: e.g. περιέχει λόγον/λόγους Τηλεμάχου καὶ Νέςτορος περὶ so that ἔτι δὲ τὰ περὶ plus substantives also depend on περιέχει.[26] Whereas the substantives in the hybrid *hypp.* of 36 are nominatives, here they are accusatives due to the preceding περιέχει. It is also because of this word that their link with the Homeric text is stronger than in the other *hypp.* They are not independent texts.

---

[25] For comparable phrases, cf. the med. *hypp.* to *Od.* 9i, 10K, 11K, 12H.

[26] With this supplement consisting of substantives, the *hyp.* would be called nominal, whereas Luppe's proposed supplement (1980: 34) περιέχει ... καὶ ὡς Νέςτωρ καὶ Τηλέμαχος διαλέγονται produces a hybrid *hyp.*

Apart from περιέχει there is only one present indicative in the subordinate clause starting with ὡc (in *Od.* 6). The beginning of the *hyp.* to the sixth book partly resembles the *hyp.* in the scholia, whereas the *hyp.* to *Od.* 3 is entirely different.

41 *P.Laur.* 3, 53

Our text is written on the back of a document in a regular, generally bilinear, round hand assigned to the end of the third century AD. It has a slight slant to the left and serifs on the feet of some verticals. There are about twenty letters per line.

This fragment contains only a few words of *hypp.* to *Od.* 5 and 6 introduced as usual by book-indications and citations of the first lines. In some parts they resemble the med. *hypp.*, but there is too little preserved to describe the style.

42 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3833

The text is written on part of a leaf from a papyrus codex in an upright, rounded hand assigned to the fourth century AD. There is a single mark of elision and except for a forked paragraphus, blank spaces are the only form of punctuation. Lines have twenty-six to thirty-two letters. The first-line quotation is written in ekthesis.

On the side with vertical fibres, the right hand page, is the end of a glossary for *Od.* 17 and on the reverse side is a *hyp.* and the beginning of a glossary to *Od.* 18. This *hyp.* corresponds almost verbatim with the med. *hyp.* i. Only a few words are omitted such as ἕτερον before πτωχόν and παρὰ τῶν μνηcτήρων after δῶρα, or added, for example, τινοc or another word in l. 4 where the mss. have γενομένηc μάχηc, and τῶν in l. 9. The *hyp.* is quite short: it begins with direct discourse and concludes with a substantive plus γίνεται. The words ἐν τοῖc ἑξῆc (l. 8) refer to the Homeric text. There are two conjunctions, δέ and καί.

1.3 Comparative survey of papyri

Five papyri stem from Oxyrhynchus, one from Panopolis, one from Antinoopolis, the ostracon (**37**) from Upper Egypt. The provenance of the other six papyri is unknown. The majority of the texts are assigned to the second or third century AD, though **29**, **31**, **32** and **42** have assigned dates between the third/fourth and sixth century AD. Most texts (**30**, **32-36**, **39**, **41**) are written on the back of docu-

ments in hands varying between clumsy and more advanced school hands to practised, carefully executed hands. As for the other texts, the ostracon and one papyrus of which the back is blank (31) are written in school hands; the codex 42 (29 unknown), 38 with *hypp.* on both sides, and 40, of which the back is blank, present elegant experienced hands.

There are no lectional signs preserved in 31, 32, 34, 35, 41; diaereses and/or apostrophes occur in 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 42; stops in 29, 30, 37, 40; a colon at the end of a *hyp.* in 38; and a rough breathing in 40. Paragraphi are present in 30, 39 and 42. There are no line-fillers. 29 abbreviates the word θεός as customary in Christian writings. Except for 32, 33, 38, 41, and 42, all papyri contain itacisms or errors, some of which have been corrected.

Five papyri have about twenty-four letters per line or less (31, 33, 39-41); five have between twenty-five and thirty (30, 32, 34, 37, 42) and four have ca. thirty-four or thirty-five letters per line (29, 35, 36, 38). The column width of 39-41 is 5-7 cm, that of the latter groups ranges primarily between 8 and 10.5 cm. 36 is exceptionally broad: ca. 15 cm. The format of the school hands 31-33 and 37 is not representative for the other texts.

When headings, that is book-indications, are present, they are usually indented and written on a new line: cf. 29, 34, 35, 38, 41, 42. This layout occurs only once in 36, where book indications are usually written at the end of the preceding *hyp.* On 39, see commentary. The *incipits* always begin new lines: they either fill one line or more than one; in the second case, the text of the *hyp.* follows immediately. 36, which has very broad lines, presents the *incipit* and the beginning of the *hyp.* on one line. In 42, the *incipit* is written in ekthesis.

All the Homeric *hypp.* are transmitted independently of the Homeric text.[27] 29-37 are concerned with the *Il.*, 38 with both *Il.* and *Od.* and 39-42 with the *Od.* Six papyri (34-36, 38-40) stem from collections of *hypp.* arranged by book. Four papyri contain *hypp.* followed by glossaries: 29 and 33 have only *hypp.* and glossaries to one book of the *Il.* (resp. *Il.* 1 and 7) in contrast to 39 and 42. Whereas the latter two texts are probably part of collections of *hypp.* plus glossaries arranged by book, 29 and 33 may deal only with one book (cf. comm.). The same holds for 30, which has part of the *hyp.* preserved

---

[27] However, it is possible that the rest of the papyrus codex from which 29 forms part, contained the text of the *Il.*

in 29, preceded by a catechism concerning characters of the *Il.* and a narrative of *antehomerica*, that is, a story about the cause of the Trojan war. It is likely that this papyrus once contained a glossary comparable to the one in 29. Papyri 31, 32, and 37, which stem from a school context and have one *hyp.* each, were probably written separately, that is, without other *hypp.*, although they may ultimately go back to a larger collection of *hypp.*

Two noteworthy observations can be made: first, the combination of *hypp.* and glossaries occurs either in school texts (33, 39) written on the back of documents or in papyrus codices (29, 42) written in experienced hands. This means that it was not only students who wrote and used *hypp.* with or without glossaries but also people who were experienced writers or who owned copies written by experienced scribes. Second, the variety in the contents of the *hypp.* is not responsible for the variety in hands, presence or absence of glossaries, and use of writing material. The physical aspects of the papyri with nominal or hybrid *hypp.* (36, 40) do not seem to be significantly different from the other papyri, though 36 has a remarkably broad column width.

1.4 Hypotheses in the medieval manuscripts

It appears that the Homeric *hypp.* on papyrus show differences not only in the way they have been preserved—alone or in collections of *hypp.*, with or without glossaries and other *(ante)homerica*—but also in their selection of contents, length and style. The same phenomenon can be observed in the *hypp.* transmitted in the med. mss. The *hypp.* are usually incorporated among other material such as scholia, paraphrases or the Homeric text itself[28] so that first-line quotations can be omitted, and their style varies considerably. A detailed discussion of each *hyp.* and the precise syntax and contents is beyond the scope of this book, so only some general remarks will be made.[29]

There are usually two med. *hypp.* to each book of the *Il.* (on the *Od.* see below), a short one (I) and a long one (II).[30] The majority of

---

[28] For a description of the contents of med. mss., cf. Schimberg (1890, 1891, 1892).

[29] The following survey is restricted to prose *hypp.* because the papyri do not preserve metrical summaries. For metrical ἐπιγραφαί on *Il.* and *Od.*, see *AP* 9, 385, a text also printed in Jahn-Michaelis (1873: 100), and Ddf. Od. I, p. 2-3.

[30] I use the edition of Bekker (1827: appendix I = cod. Paris. Gr. 2690) for both *hypp.* to *Il.* 1-9 and 11 and the edition of Bachmann (1835 = cod. Lips. Gr.

these *hypp.* can be described as discourse *hypp.* There is only one nominal *hyp.* to *Il.* 6. Some *hypp.* refer to the writer or to the text summarized. An example of each: 2I *κατάλογον δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς ἐποίησε*, see also 3II, 5II, 11II; 2II *ἑξῆς δέ ἐστιν ὁ κατάλογος* ...

The *hypp.* of the *Od.*[31] show more variety: the discourse type is still the most numerous but we also see four nominal *hypp.* (14ii, 23i, ii and 24i) and several hybrid *hypp.*[32] In some hybrid *hypp.*, there is only one nominal sentence amongst many discourse sentences (e.g. 1 HK). In other *hypp.*, the proportions are reversed (cf. e.g. 18ii) or at least different. Several *hypp.* contain words which point to the poet or to the work/book summarized: cf. e.g. *ὁ ποιητὴς ἀπαγγέλλει* and *διηγεῖται* in 17i and 19i, and *περιέχει ἡ ῥαψωδία* in 9i, on which the rest of the *hyp.* depends.[33] See further 8iii, 10i-iii, 17ii, 18K. A verb like *περιέχει* has to be supplied in 19ii, 21i, 22ii, and 24i.

The use of tenses in the med. *hypp.* is comparable to that in the papyrus *hypp.* Most finite verbs are of the present tense, but we also find aorist indicatives and imperfects where present indicatives would have fitted as well.[34] On the other hand, the past tense is not always used in the *hypp.* of *Od.* 9-12, though it fits Odysseus' retelling of his adventures; see, for instance, the many present indicatives in 10ii and iii. In short, the tenses are used rather arbitrarily so that Weinrich's distinction between "die besprechenden und erzählenden Tempora" cannot be strictly applied to the Homeric *hypp.* However, it is applicable in a broader way because the predominance of the present tense is a sign that we are concerned with a "besprechenden Text".[35]

To summarize, both the use of tenses and the variety in style agree in general with the *hypp.* on papyrus. While several med. *hypp.* have references to Homer or the Homeric text, this is quite rare in the pa-

---

32) for those to *Il.* 10, 12-24 because the long *hypp.* to these books except for *Il.* 13 are not in Bekker, whereas Bekker preserves long *hypp.* to *Il.* 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 which are not in Bachmann. A modern critical edition of the *hypp.* in the D-scholia to the *Il.* will be published by Montanari, cf. (1994: 475).

[31] The indications i, ii etc. are used to indicate the *hypp.* as edited by Ddf. Od. I, II. Jahn-Michaelis (1873: 114-120) are quoted for the text of K (cod. Monacensis 519B; Jahn-Michaelis adopt the edition of La Roche (1863: 699-707 and 711-718) and H (Harleianus Mus. Brit. 5674; which Jahn (re)collated himself).

[32] 1HK; 8ii; 10K; 11K; 12H; 18ii; 21i; 22ii.

[33] *περιέχει* occurs also in 40 and cf. 10K, 11K and *ἔχει* in 12H.

[34] Cf. *Il.* 1; 4I; 7I,II; 8I; 9I; 10II; 12I; 14II; 15II; 16I,II; 18II; 19II; 20II; 21II; 23II; 24II; *Od.* 1ii; 6ii; 8iii; 15i; 16ii; 17ii; 19K; 20K; 21K.

[35] For the use of tenses and this distinction, cf. p. 8, n. 23.

pyri: only περιέχει in 40 and ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς in 42. It appears from a closer comparison of the two groups of *hypp.* that there is only one *hyp.* on papyrus (42) which is almost the same as the med. one. All the other *hypp.* show either no agreements, or both agreements and differences, or only some small similarities in wording.[36]

1.5 More Homeric summaries

In order to determine the nature of the Homeric *hypp.* more precisely and to establish their connection with other Homeric summaries, I will briefly compare the prose accounts of the *Il.* and *Od.* in Ps.-Dositheus, Ps.-Ausonius, Apd., *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*, and Hyg. To start with Ps.-Dositheus, this grammarian composed a school book *Interpretamenta* or *Hermeneumata* at least partly in 207 AD, which comprised a section on grammar (first book), a Greek-Latin glossary (second book) and Greek-Latin stories, viz. eighteen Aesopean fables, chapters from the Genealogy of Hyg. and summaries of *Il.* 7-24 (third book). The summaries of *Il.* 7-24[37] agree with the *hypp.* in their adherence to individual books. For the rest they are quite different irrespective of some small verbal similarities. The length of these elementary texts varies considerably, and they are full of phonetic errors.

Ps.-Ausonius' *Periochae Homeri Iliadis et Odyssiae*[38] consist of prose synopses in Latin of each book of the *Il.* and *Od.* preceded by the citation of the first (two) line(s) of the book plus their metrical translation in Latin. These Latin synopses written in the present tense are quite similar to the Greek *hypp.* in length and style and reveal both close verbal agreements and considerable differences. An examination of Ps.-Ausonius' sources falls outside the scope of this book, but their author seems to have known a collection of Greek *hypp.*

[36] Without more textual evidence, it is impossible to reconstruct or date the precise stages in the transmission of the *hypp.* It is clear that the med. mss. contain a mixture of material that was transmitted separately in the papyri—see also the MH papyri—but we do not know how and when the various texts relating to Homer were blended together, cf. p. 116.

[37] Cf. the text in Jahn-Michaelis (1873: 102-111) and Götz (1892: 60ff.).

[38] The attribution by ms. H of the *Periochae* to Ausonius, who lived in the fourth century AD, is to be doubted, cf. Green's introduction to his edition of the text (1991: 677).

The Apollodorean synopsis of the *Il.* is only preserved in *Epit.* 4.[39] Instead of presenting summaries of individual books, the text is one continuous, rapid synopsis of the *Il.* It omits all actions of the gods except for two occurrences of Aphrodite and Hephaestus, and the contents of *Il.* 13-15 and 20. Part of these omissions may be due to the writer of the *Epit.*, but certainly not all of them (cf. App. One 1.3). The text of Apd. has a somewhat unusual but interesting parallel: the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina.*

The name *Tabulae Iliacae* is applied to twenty-one low reliefs, most of marble, which often have extensive inscriptions.[40] They are found in Rome or the Roman Campagna, and their date varies between mid-Augustan (*Tab. Il. Capit.*) and late Antonine. The largest table, the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (hereafter indicated by the conventional abbreviation 1A),[41] was once ca. 25 by 42 cm. It contains scenes from the *Il.* accompanied by inscriptions and, in a separate column, a synopsis of the *Il.* This synopsis shows some noticeable similarities to Apd. *Epit.* 4, 3ff.:[42] it also omits the actions of the gods except for Thetis and Hephaestus who are mentioned in connection with Achilles' weapons, and *Il.* 20, and it summarizes books 13-15 in a few words. There are several verbal agreements: compare, for example, the accounts of *Il.* 16 and 17 in App. Two, where the complete synopsis preserved in 1A and the comparable text of Apd. is printed. In 1A, all finite verbs are present indicatives, which is the same in the *Epit.* except for two aorist indicatives in subordinate clauses. Elsewhere Apd. never has so many, that is thirty, present indicatives in a sequence (cf. App. One 1.3). The main difference between the two texts is that 1A is more extensive than the *Epit.*[43] Minor divergencies are due to varying expressions: e.g. 1A uses several times Ἀχαιοί and μάχην cυνάπτω, where the *Epit.* has Ἕλληνες and μάχηc γενομένηc.

[39] The largest part is preserved in the *Epit. Sabbaitica* and only one section in *Epit. Vaticana.* For Apd. and the epitomes, cf. p. 26ff. and App. One, esp. 1.3.

[40] The first comprehensive study is Jahn-Michaelis (1873). Then, the twenty known tables were amply discussed by Anna Sadurska (1964). Horsfall (1979) revived the discussion on certain aspects of the tables and he published (1983) the twenty-first table.

[41] This and the other abbreviations used are listed in Horsfall (1979: 48).

[42] The differences between the Iliadic scenes and the synopsis point to independent sources (cf. Horsfall 1979: 46), for which reason only the latter is discussed.

[43] It is possible that the writer of the *Epit.* has omitted parts of the *Bibl.*, which causes this difference.

In short, regarding both the similarities and the differences, we may perhaps conclude that the synopses had a common source.[44]

This source was probably not the *Il.* itself but a synopsis, as can be deduced from a comparison with the Homeric *hypp.* In contrast to the latter, which summarize the contents of each book preceded by an *incipit*, Apd. and 1A are continuous synopses which are far more concise than the *hypp.* and omit all actions of the gods.[45] Resemblances between the texts are restricted to small verbal similarities: papyri **34** (regarding *Il.* 7 and 8), **36** (*Il.* 16) and **38** (*Il.* 22) share some expressions with both the *Epit.* and 1A or with one of them. The same holds for the *hypp.* transmitted in the med. mss.: cf. e.g. *hypp.* to *Il.* 7, 10 and 16.[46] In short, the *hypp.* are far more closely related to Homer than the *Epit.* and 1A, which seem to transmit information in a rationalized (in view of the absence of gods) and abridged form.[47]

---

[44] The work of Apd. has several times been connected with the *Tabulae Iliacae* in general, but the agreements enumerated above have not been mentioned before: although Wilamowitz (1884: 332ff.; again in 1925: 54ff. and in 1937: 497-501) observes textual resemblance between Apd. *Epit.* and Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, he only calls attention to the similar nature of the mythographical texts of Apd., Hyg. and 1A; Sadurska (1964: 9) mentions the *Bibl.* in view of *tabulae* 9D and 10K, but writes "Les épitomés prosaïques de l'Iliade (A N° 1, G N° 14) n'ont pas de parallèles directes".

[45] **34** omits the gods as well, but still provides a fuller summary than the *Epit.* and 1A, cf. its discussion on p. 59.

[46] Cf. *hyp. Il.* 7I Ἑλένου cυμβουλεύcαντοc Ἕκτωρ προκαλεῖται τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸν ἄριcτον εἰc μονομαχίαν. ἐννέα δὲ ἀναcτάντων ἔλαχεν Αἴαc ὁ Τελαμώνιοc, καὶ γενναίωc αὐτοὺc ἀγωνιcαμένουc διαλύουcι κήρυκεc ἑcπέραc γενομένηc ...; *hyp. Il.* 10I ... πέμπουcι καταcκόπουc εἰc τὸ τῶν Τρώων cτρατόπεδον Ὀδυccέα καὶ Διομήδην, οἳ Δόλωνα μὲν cυναντήcαντεc ἀναιροῦcι· πυθόμενοι δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ Ῥῆcον καὶ Θρᾷκαc παρεῖναι, ἔνθα ἐcτρατοπεδεύcαντο ...; *hyp. Il.* 16II ... ἀναφερομένηc δὲ τῆc φλογὸc θεαcάμενοc Ἀχιλλεὺc καὶ καθοπλίcαc τὸν ἑταῖρον ἐκπέμπει cὺν Μυρμιδόcιν. καὶ ὁ μὲν παραγίνεται καὶ πολλοὺc ἀναιρεῖ τῶν Τρώων, ἐν οἷc καὶ Cαρπηδόνα τὸν Διόc· ἔπειτα δὲ ἀναιρεῖται ὑπὸ Ἕκτοροc.

[47] An important study on the purpose of the *Tabulae* is by Horsfall (1979: esp. 31ff.) which enumerates the main objections against earlier theories that described them as visual aids in the classroom, as votive offerings, or as objects connected with the imperial cult. Horsfall's own theory more or less specifies Sadurska's conclusion (1964: 18-19) that the reliefs constituted some form of library decoration. In view of the nature of the texts and the technical virtuosity, Horsfall suggests that the tables, which were certainly not mass products, were destined for a small public that wanted to make an educated impression. He adduces several literary sources to determine the owners of the *Tabulae* and concludes (35): "We are thus brought firmly back to the world of Trimalchio, to the libraries and dining rooms of the new rich, where ignorance is to be hidden and memories have to be jolted at every step." This idea is attractive but we cannot

The summary of the *Il.* is even more concise in Hyg. *Fab.* 106: it is a brief prose account of the main events of *Il.* 1, 16, 19, 22 and 24 written in the past tense. In the neighbourhood of this story are some catalogues that are linked to the *Il.*: see *Fab.* 97, a catalogue of ships (cf. p. 125 commentary on pap. 59), and 112-115, enumerations of the fights and killings of the Greeks and Trojans.

Apd. and Hyg. also contain summaries of the *Od.* which can be compared with the Homeric *hypp.* Apd. *Epit.* 7, 2-33 and Hyg. *Fab.* 125[48] are similar chronological accounts of Odysseus' adventures beginning with his departure from Troy and ending with the death of the suitors. The greater part of both accounts are concerned with Odysseus' adventures preceding his stay with Calypso. Telemachus is only mentioned at the end, and gods play minor roles. Athena, for instance, is absent in Apd. and occurs only once in Hyg. The *hypp.* on the other hand pay due attention to Telemachus' important role in the first books of the *Od.* (cf. **38**, **39**) and to the role of the gods throughout the works (cf. **40**, **41**).

The version of Apd. is in general more detailed than the Hyginean text, although the reverse occurs as well. Remarkable is the catalogue of suitors in *Epit.* 7, 26-30 which is not present in the *Od.* Another example of information not adopted from the *Od.* is present in both Apd. and Hyg.: *Epit.* 7, 16 relates that Telegonus is born to Odysseus and Circe, and *Fab.* 125.10 mentions even their two sons, Telegonus and Nausithous. Such extra information clearly illustrates the process of contamination of excerpts and summaries, of which both Apd. and Hyg. are products, contrary to the Homeric *hypp.* which restrict themselves to the contents of the *Od.*

To summarize, Ps.-Ausonius shows the greatest resemblance to the Homeric *hypp.* preserved in the papyri and in the med. mss. These texts seem to have no connection with the Homeric summaries in Ps.-Dositheus, Apd., 1A, and Hyg.

---

exclude the possibility that the *Tabulae* fulfilled some function in the education of the children of rich Romans. The mentality described by Horsfall recalls the preface to Apd. *Bibl.*, which invokes its readers to read the *Bibl.* instead of the original works, cf. Introduction p. XIV.

[48] *Fab.* 126 *Ulyssis cognitio* is an extensive retelling of the events following on Odysseus' return to Ithaca, in which many direct speeches are incorporated. This characteristic is not paralleled in the *hypp.*

1.6 Function and readership

The papyri give us two clues about their usage. First, the presence of introductory material in 30 and glossaries in addition to the *hypp.* (29, 33, 39, 42) indicates that these *hypp.* were not meant to be read for their own sakes. They point to the preparation for and the actual reading of Homer. Second, we have seen that six texts were written by students or teachers (30-33, 37, 39). So, part of the *hypp.* originated and were used in a school context.

It appears from the group of Homeric *hypp.* that differences in the use of tenses are more telling about the author of the text and the purpose for which he has summarized the material than about the actual use of such a text. Although there are only aorist indicatives in the *hyp.* in 29, which help to indicate that the text is a retelling,[49] it does not seem to have been used or read for a different purpose than the *hypp.* in 33, 39 and 42, which contain present indicatives: all these *hypp.* have the same introductory or auxiliary function in view of the presence of glossaries.[50]

The other seven papyri which present neither school hands nor glossaries may also have been used before or while reading Homer, but this is probably not the only usage. The nominal *hypp.* of 36 are very similar to an index, for which purpose they and the other *hypp.* of this papyrus might have been composed. Comparable are two papyri which seem to contain tables of contents, viz. *P.Ryl.* 1, 19 and *P.Oxy.* 4, 665. These papyri preserve lists of substantives which enumerate the main events: the Rylands papyrus enumerates the contents of the 47th book of Theopompus' *Philippica*, and the Oxyrhynchus

---

[49] Theoretically (cf. p. 8 n. 23), the present tense is typical of synopses whereas the past tense accompanied by other narrative elements indicates that the text is a retelling. The word order of 29, to which much attention seems to have been paid, agrees with the character of a retelling.

[50] Marrou (1948: 229) refers to 29 and 40 (and to the *hypp.* 1a, 12, 16 and 26) as examples of summaries put before children to prepare them for the reading of literature: "l'enfant n'abordait pas immédiatement le texte des poètes; on lui proposait d'abord des résumés, *ποιητικὰϲ ὑποθέϲειϲ*: arguments de l'épopée entière ou de tel chant, des pièces de théâtre ou des discours." This idea is based on Plut. *Aud. Poet.* 14E, which states which kinds of writing are enjoyed most by young students: *οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ Αἰϲώπεια μυθάρια καὶ τὰϲ ποιητικὰϲ ὑποθέϲειϲ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἄβαριν τὸν Ἡρακλείδου καὶ τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίϲτωνοϲ* ... Marrou is perhaps right to refer to summaries of Homer, plays and speeches, but there is no further indication of the contents or the sense of the word *ὑποθέϲειϲ*. Were they prose or poetical summaries?

papyrus is an index to a Sicilian history. These tables of contents are not meant to be read in themselves, they only assisted the reader in finding the passage wanted.[51] It is thus possible that the nominal *hypp.* had an auxiliary function as well.

Other *hypp.* might have been read for their own sakes: in this way, a reader could quickly refresh his/her memory or learn about the contents of the most famous work in antiquity. O'Hara (*ed. pr.* of **34**) suggests that the *hypp.* "without gods may have been meant not to introduce the *Iliad*, but at least partially to replace it." The detailed account of the contents may support this idea. Only the six school texts give an idea about their owners or writers, who were students and one teacher. The other papyri do not betray the identity of their readership.

2 *Callimachean diegeses*

2.1 Introduction

The term Callimachean *diegeses* is derived from the following title found in *P.Mil.Vogl.* 1, 18 (= **43**): Τῶν δ Αἰτίων Καλλιμάχου διηγήϲειϲ. These words refer to a kind of summary that briefly states the contents of Callimachus' *Aetia*. This usage of the term *diegesis* seems to agree with both the general meaning of 'narration, narrative' (LSJ) of varying length and the meaning it has in speeches, namely 'statement of the case or facts'. The term occurs also in a comparable text in scholia on Theocritus, where *Id.* 14 is summarized: Ἐν τούτωι τῶι εἰδυλλίωι διήγηϲίϲ ἐϲτι καταϲτάϲεωϲ ἐρωτικῆϲ καὶ Κυνίϲκαϲ ἔρωτοϲ. ἡ γὰρ γυνὴ τοῦ Αἰϲχίνου μᾶλλον προϲέκειτο Λύκωι τινί, καταφρονοῦϲα τοῦ Αἰϲχίνου. Θυωνίχου δέ τινοϲ ἑταίρου προϲιόντοϲ αὐτῶι διὰ χρόνου δικαίωϲ εἰϲάγεται προλέγων 'χαίρειν πολλά' ὁ Αἰϲχίνηϲ.[52]

---

[51] A. Gellius states the purpose of such a table of contents in the preface to his *Noctes Atticae*: *Capita rerum, quae cuique commentario insunt, exposuimus hic uniuersa, ut iam statim declaretur, quid quo in libro quaeri inuenirique potest.*

[52] Text quoted from ed. Wendel (1914). *diegesis* might have the same meanings in the following examples: in *P.Ryl.* 3, 540, a papyrus with the text of *Il.* 2, 251-875 and *antehomerica*, one sentence introduces the pre-homeric prose history, calling it *diegesis*: τιϲ θελήϲ[αϲ . .]ι τοῦτον [τὸ]ν τρόπον τὴν διήγηϲ[ιν π]οιούμε[ν]οϲ οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτά[νοι τῆϲ ἀ]ληθείαϲ· See also Κόνωνοϲ διηγήϲειϲ, a collection of fifty summaries of Conon's stories made by Photius (*FGrHist* 26 F 1). *P.Oxy.* 52, 3648 has parts of two stories which are closer to the original text of Conon. For διήγηϲιϲ in a rhetorical context, cf. Montefusco (1988: 33ff.).

Each *diegesis* consists of the citation of the first line of the poem and the statement or retelling of the contents. The following paragraphs discuss the papyri that consist of or have been connected with *diegeses*. The order in which the papyri are discussed is not strictly based on the order of poems summarized: the most extensive papyrus is discussed first.

2.2 Papyri

43 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 1, 18

This papyrus roll was found among some 750 other papyri in the famous 'cantina dei papiri', a store-room of material to be burnt, in Tebtunis. As Gallazzi (1990: 283-288) and Clarysse (1983: 43-61, esp. 49) state, it has been suggested that our papyrus belongs to the archive of Laches, who was a member of a Hellenic family of prosperous farmers. Against this idea, both scholars point out that the *cantina* stored all kinds of discarded paper so that there is no relationship between the *diegeses* papyrus and the documents of Laches. It is thus not possible to draw conclusions on the ownership of this papyrus.

This papyrus preserves parts of thirteen columns of text, of which the last column is left blank from the third line onwards. The back is blank. It appears that the scribe first measured and marked the beginnings and ends of the columns and the intercolumnar margins before he wrote the text itself.[53] The upper and lower margin are resp. 4 and 5 cm at most. The text is written in an irregular, upright hand with cursive forms assigned to the end of the first or beginning of the second century AD. The layout is irregular as well.[54] The *diegeses* are separated from each other by blank lines in which long paragraphi are sometimes written (cf. col. IV, col. VI once and col. VIIff.). In columns I-VII until l. 256, first-line quotations are written in ekthesis.

---

[53] The markings which the scribe made to guide the layout of his text begin continually further to the left (Maas's Law, for which see *GMAW* 5) which confirms Johnson's suggestion (1992: 230) "that the slanted column was a deliberate and popular style, and not the result of some mechanical defect in the production of the book".

[54] Column height varies from 22.2 to 20.9 cm (from col. VI onwards); column width varies both in columns and among the columns: the smallest width is 7.5 to 8 cm (col. IV; cf. column-to-column width = 9 to 9.3 cm) and the broadest column, col. X, is 10.3 to 10 cm (cf. col.-to-col. width = 12.2 to 11.4 cm).

In addition to this, we sometimes find a short paragraphus beneath the quotation (cf. ll. 250, 298, 318, 338, 385, 397). A few times, the first letter of a column (cf. ll. 232, 266) or of a *diegesis* has been enlarged (cf. ll. 339, 345, 350, 364). There are many errors and some corrections. No lectional signs appear except for one breathing, some high stops, diaereses and line-fillers.

The extent of this papyrus is so large that it contains *diegeses* of *Aetia* books 3 and 4, of the *Iambi*, *Lyrica*, the *Hecale*, and *Hymns* 1 and 2. These *diegeses* present large differences in length and contents. The length varies from twelve words (cf. ll. 110-112) to more than twenty-four lines (cf. l. 398ff.).[55] Most *diegeses* are short prose accounts of the contents of Callimachus poems. They sometimes seem to adopt phrases from the poems, cf. ll. 247-248 with *Iambus* 4, 102-103. The words διόπερ καὶ ὑμεῖc ... ἀποβλέπετε (ll. 348-349) probably paraphrase an address to the public in the poem. Another aberration from the usual prose account are ll. 350-353 and 354-357 which resemble the Homeric hybrid *hypp.* with a mixture of substantives and discourse sentences.

In contrast to the Homeric *hypp.* (cf. p. 68), the *diegeses* often refer to the author or the poems. This happens especially at the beginnings. The *Aetia diegeses* start, for example, with φηcὶν (six times), φηcὶν ὅτι (three times), ὅτι, ἑξῆc φηcι, ἑξῆc, icτορεῖ περὶ, and λέγεται ὡc (once each). The *diegeses* of the other works display a more varied beginning, for instance καταμέμφεται (l. 225; *Iamb.* 3), τοῦτο γέγραπται εἰc (ll. 331-332; *Iamb.* 12), παροίνιον εἰc τοὺc Διοcκούρουc· (ll. 350-351; Παννυχίc), and προτερατευcάμενοc ὡc (l. 398; *Hymn* 2). There are also a few references to the author in the middle of the *diegeses*, see for example ll. 220 φηcίν, 228-229 παρεπικόπτει, 238 παρατίθεται, 315 ἐπαινεῖ. Only few *diegeses* have no references, cf. e.g. ll. 62-74, 101-108, 263-285, 358-384.

Direct discourse is most common, but several *diegeses* that are introduced by words like φηcι(ν) have the accusative and infinitive in the entire *diegesis* (cf. ll. 173-186) or in part of it (cf. e.g. 34-48). The tenses of the finite verbs vary in accordance with the contents: present tense occurs primarily when verbs refer to the author or to the poem, in descriptions (cf. 62-73, where a purification rite is described;

[55] If Pfeiffer (1949: 71) is right in suggesting that ll. 8-9 belong to the first *diegesis* on Acontius and Cydippe, this *diegesis* must have filled more than one column, that is, at least forty-four lines.

see also 80-84, 135-139) and in introductions of aetia (e.g. 265 and 308 ... τιμᾶται/ἱερουργεῖται ἐντεῦθεν). It sometimes occurs in combination with verbs in the past tense (cf. 58-61 and 196-212). The past tense occurs chiefly in the sections that relate past events, that is in the actual aetiological stories, cf. for example 266ff. It is not unthinkable that the past tense in the *diegeses* reflects a past tense in the poems. There are all kinds of subordinate clauses with verbs of various tenses, moods, and voices, participles (chiefly predicate), conjunctions, pronouns and a few adverbs and adjectives. There are many composite verbs as is common in later prose.[56]

The *Hecale-diegesis* (ll. 367-389) resembles the narrative *hypp.* both in layout and in contents: the title ʽΕκάλης is written in the middle of the line,[57] followed by the first-line quotation and the prose account of the contents; this text has no references to the author or to the work summarized, the main sentences are linked by δέ, and the finite verbs of those sentences are always indicatives in the past tense. On the other hand, it differs from the narrative *hypp.* because repetition is not avoided (αἰφνίδιον occurs three times, and cf. ἐξελθεῖν ... ἐξελθών, χειρώσαιτο ... χειρωσάμενος, προσδοκήσαντι ... τῆς προσδοκίας), words occur which are not needed for a correct understanding of the text and which would probably have been omitted in the narrative *hypp.* (e.g. αἰφνίδιον; ὅπως χειρώσαιτο, 369-370; ἐξελθών, 372; ἐνταῦθα, 374), and because some other characteristics such as μέν-δέ-constructions and participles used substantively are not present.

44 *PSI* 11, 1219

The text, known as the 'Scholia Florentina', is written in a non-calligraphic hand assigned to the second or early third century AD. The back is blank and there is a left margin of 5 cm, which is perhaps the initial margin rather than an intercolumnar one. First-line quotations are written in ekthesis and there are many abbreviations. Paragraphi, line-fillers and diaereses are used.

Lines 1-20 are concerned with the prologue to the *Aet.* (cf. Pf. frr. 1 and 2). The quotation of the first line of the prologue is followed by an enumeration of the names of the Telchines, which are not mentioned in *Aet.* fr. 1 itself. These lines (2-11) are therefore more

---

[56] For the style and language of the *diegeses*, cf. Castiglioni (1937: 146-154).

[57] For the genitive ʽΕκάλης, cf. n. 2. One should probably supplement something like διήγησις τῆς.

like a learned commentary than a *diegesis* as described above. Lines 12-20, on the other hand, seem to report the contents of the *Aition* prologue without giving much additional information. Ll. 21-37 consist of the quotation of the first line and a prose account of the first *Aition* (Pf. frr. 3-7). Ll. 35-37 mention Callimachus' source (Agias and Dercylus) and the presence of this story in Aristotle. It is not clear whether this information is adopted from Callimachus' poem itself or from a commentary on it. The Milan *diegeses* do not have similar endings. Ll. 38ff. preserve a first-line quotation and the prose account of another *Aition* (cf. Pf. frr. 7-25).

There are several references to the author, among others, l. 12 *πα-ρα]τίθεταί*, 15 *φάcκων*, 21 and 39 *ζητεῖ διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν* and 30 *φηcιν*. The syntax and vocabulary seem to be comparable to that in the Milan papyrus. Ll. 22ff., for instance, have present indicatives in the introduction of the *Aition* (*ζητεῖ-θύουcι*) and past indicatives (ll. 23-29) in its retelling. Compare also the wording of ll. 8-9 *-μεμφομένοιc - ποιημάτων* with 43, 339-341 *καταμεμφομένουc - ποιημάτων*.

45 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2263

The text is written on the back of a piece of papyrus in a practised hand of the common angular type assigned to the late second or third century AD. The front is blank except for part of a single line of second-century cursive running in the opposite direction. There are diaereses, a line-filler, and a second pen has added lectional signs to the original text of fr. 2.

This papyrus contains *diegeses* of *Aetia* book 1 (cf. Pf. ad fr. 26-31f). The remains of col. I seem to be the end of one *diegesis* (col. I, 14-19), a first-line quotation (l. 20) and the beginning of a second *diegesis* which concludes in col. II, 8. Col. II, 9ff. preserves a quotation and a third *diegesis*. Col. III has the remains of one more *diegesis* if l. 6 does not contain a lemma (cf. Pf. 111). The contents of this papyrus are comparable to the preceding ones. There are one or two references to Callimachus in the text; cf. col. II, 6-7—only here his name is explicitly mentioned—and perhaps col. I, 21-22 *ζητεῖ διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν*, if the supplement is correct. Col. II, 6-8, where Callimachus' source (Agias and Dercylus) is mentioned, is very similar to 44, 35-36 and in col. II, 10ff. we see again that the finite verbs which retell the actual aetia display a past tense whereas the introduction has *ἔχει δι' αἰτίαν ταύτην*. The *diegesis* is perfectly comparable to 43, 268-290: quotation, introduction Περφεραῖοc 'Ερμῆc ἐν Αἴ⟦γει⟧νωι τῆι πόλει τῆc Θρᾳ-

κῆς τιμᾶται ἐντεῦθεν, followed by the retelling with finite verbs in the past tense.[58]

46 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2258, fr. 9 back a-d

This fragment is part of a sumptuous papyrus codex which contains poems of Callimachus accompanied by explanatory material. Our text is written in a large formal hand of the Coptic type, which may be dated in the fifth, sixth or early seventh century AD. The same scribe appears to be responsible for at least one other ms. with a text of Apollonius Rhodius.[59] There is an upper margin of almost 7 cm. No lectional signs appear except for one middle stop.

The text seems to preserve remains of another summary of the *Hecale* (cf. 43, 362-384). In contrast to the *diegeses* in the other papyri, this summary is found together with poems of Callimachus. It may have been derived from a collection of *diegeses* or it may not be a *diegesis*: there is too little left to say more about the nature of this piece.

47 *P.Mich.* inv. 6235

The text is written against the fibres on the back of a document in regular, formal rounded capitals assigned to the second or third century AD. There are no lectional signs except for one or two high stops. Horizontal strokes function as line-fillers.

It is uncertain whether the contents of this papyrus consist of Callimachean *diegeses*. Lines 1-7 seem to be concerned with Apollo, l. 8 is vacant, and lines 9-24 probably contain a prose narration about king Teuthis and a statue of Athena with bandaged thigh. Hollis (1992: 115) points out that the myth of Teuthis was treated in *Aetia* book 1 and that the Michigan papyrus may contain Callimachean *diegeses* in

---

[58] *ἐντεῦθεν* has the same meaning as *δι' αἰτίαν ταύτην* (or *δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην*, *διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν* or *δι' αἰτίαν τήνδε*), which appears also from sch. Eur. *Or.* 34 where *ἐντεῦθεν* is paraphrased by *ἐκ τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης*. Instead of simple adverbs, Hellenistic prose often uses adverbial expressions consisting of substantives with or without prepositions, e.g. *τόπος* plus preposition instead of *ἐκεῖ*, *αὐτοῦ*, *αὐτόθι*; *αἰτία* plus preposition instead of *ὅτι* or *ὅθεν* (cf. Palm 1955: 126ff.). The occurrence of *αἰτία* in the *diegeses* might be due to this general practice, cf. the expressions in the MH - sch. *Il.* 9, 448 *Φοῖνιξ ... ἐξέπεσε τῆς οἰκείας γῆς δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην*; *Od.* 12, 69; and Apd. 1, 9, 17; 2, 4, 11; 3, 5, 5.

[59] Cf. 'scribe 14' in Krüger (1990: 194). For the date of the hand, cf. *GMAW* 47.

view of the contents and the format.[60] Especially line 9 is important for the classification of this papyrus. The first editors suggest that ἔχον- | [τες] was syntactically connected with a preceding first-line quotation ending 'Αθήνης, but Hollis rightly observes that such an integration is surprising and not paralleled in the other *diegeses*. His own solution regarding the problematic 'Αθήνης ἔχον seems preferable: the prose summary starts at the beginning of l. 9 and 'Αθήνης is written instead of 'Αθηνᾶς; This misspelling may have been caused by a preceding 'Αθήνης, which would have formed the end of the first-line quotation in l. 8.[61] However, we cannot exclude the possibility that l. 8 forms the end of the preceding section, or that it was left blank, or that it contains a kind of title or heading. The word 'Αθήνης may form part (not of a first-line quotation but) of a short citation perhaps integrated with the surrounding text. To conclude, the nature of this papyrus and its connection with the Callimachean *diegeses* is questionable.

2.3 Comparative survey of papyri

One papyrus stems from Tebtunis, three from Oxyrhynchus, and the provenance of **47** is unknown. The backs of **43** and **44** are blank, **46** is a papyrus codex, **47** is written on the back of a document, and the text of **45** is written on the back of a papyrus, of which the front is blank except for one trace. The texts are written in practised hands with assigned dates from the first or second to the sixth or seventh century AD, and they contain some stops, diaereses, paragraphi and line-fillers. On top of this, **43** has a breathing, **45** contains lectional signs added by a second pen, and **44** employs many abbreviations.

Although the *diegeses* differ considerably from each other, most of them contain words referring to the activities of the author or to the contents of the original poem. This explains the frequent use of indirect discourse. In contrast to the Homeric and narrative *hypp.* many conjunctions, adverbs, adjectives and particles are used. For the relationship of the papyri and their origin, cf. p. 82.

[60] In contrast to the first editors, Hollis (1992: 115) and Cameron (1995: 120) connect this pap. with the other *diegeses*-papyri.

[61] Instead of postulating an extraordinarily wide column so that l. 8 could have comprised a complete hexameter, an idea suggested to Hollis by Barrett, it is more likely that l. 8 contained only part of the first verse.

2.4 Function and readership

For what reason and what kind of people were the *diegeses* written? One papyrus gives us a clue about its owner: not only the frequent usage of abbreviations, but also the presence of additional information in **44** suggests that this papyrus is a scholar's text. The hands and contents of the other three papyri are not very helpful in determining their readership. We may only recall that the summary to the *Hecale* in **46** forms part of a papyrus codex which was written by a professional scribe in a calligraphic hand. More useful is the knowledge that the summary is transmitted together with the text of Callimachus' poems, which may point to an introductory function. The other papyri transmit the *diegeses* separate from Callimachus' poems. This makes it necessary to investigate whether the function of these *diegeses* can be deduced from their contents.

We may first observe that the *diegeses* follow the order of Callimachus' poems and are linked to them by the first-line quotations. Second, most *diegeses* are prose accounts readable in themselves without the original text, whereas others only indicate the subject of the poem without giving any details (cf. **43**, 110-112 and 350-361). These observations suggest that the *diegeses* may have been a kind of survey written for people who were interested in the contents not in the literary aspects of Callimachus' poems. This provokes the question whether the *diegeses* were meant to replace the original poems or whether they were rather meant to serve as introductory or auxiliary texts to be read or used before or in addition to the reading of Callimachus' poems. The concise form of some of the *diegeses* and the additional information in **44** are arguments in favour of the latter.

3 Conclusions

The papyri examined in this chapter are arranged in two groups according to the different works they summarize. Is this the only difference between the papyri with Homeric *hypp.* and those with Callimachean *diegeses*? Or are there more features that distinguish them from each other? The answers to these questions may be deduced from the following survey which contains conclusions about the kind of information that is transmitted in the papyri, the form in which this is done, the relationship with other literature, and the function and readership.

Both the Homeric *hypp.* and the Callimachean *diegeses* are linked to the books or poems they summarize by the quotation of their first lines. In addition to this, the *diegeses* often refer to the author or the poems, whereas such references are rare in the Homeric *hypp.* on papyrus (cf. p. 68). Most *hypp.* and *diegeses* consist of clear prose summaries of the original poems. The differences in the contents of the Callimachean papyri, such as the additional information in **44**, the source indications which occur in **44** and **45** but not in **43**, differences in length and in the manner in which the stories are introduced, may be the result of the variety in contents of the Callimachean poems themselves. It seems possible that the contents of all the papyri (**43**-**47**) go back to one work which was far more extensive in the beginning than later on. At a certain point, the writer of the *diegeses* might have dropped his practice of providing additional information.[62]

The Homeric *hypp.* are far from uniform in their style, contents and physical aspects. We have seen that the lengths of the complete *hypp.* range between nineteen and a hundred words. Some papyri stem from collections of *hypp.* arranged by book, others contain *hypp.* in combination with glosses, and once with a catechism and story of *antehomerica.* While some *hypp.* are elementary products, others are carefully constructed summaries. Part of the differences regarding length and contents may be explained as follows: first, *hypp.* at the beginning of a collection may have been more extensive or better constructed than *hypp.* in the middle or at the end of the same collection. The same phenomenon is visible in the scholia minora on the *Il.* Second, some *hypp.* are obviously school exercises or adaptations of exemplary *hypp.* (cf. **31**, **33**, **37**, and **39**). However, the presence of several *hypp.* to each book of the *Il.* and *Od.*, on papyrus and in the med. mss., and the unique style and contents of the *hypp.* in **34** and **36** as compared to the texts of the other papyri and med. *hypp.*, cannot be explained except by the existence of various collections of Homeric *hypp.* It is thus impossible to speak about one author and one collection of Homeric *hypp.* as in the case of the narrative *hypp.* in Chapter One. Yet some of the *hypp.* seem to have been copied on a larger scale, as may be deduced from the agreement between the *hypp.* in papyri **29** and **30**—the first papyrus stems from Panopolis and is assigned to the third or fourth century AD, whereas the second is

---

[62] Cf. Cameron (1995: 120-121) who argues that the similarities between the Callimachean texts are much closer than generally recognized.

found in Oxyrhynchus and is assigned to the second century AD—and from the similarities between the *hypp.* on papyrus and those in med. mss. (cf. the discussions of **35**, **38**, and esp. of **42**). It is not unreasonable to suggest that it was the most useful and widespread *hypp.* that found their way into the med. mss.

Let us now consider the relationship between the *hypp.* and the *diegeses* with other literature. A comparison with some mythographic writings that summarize the *Il.* and *Od.* reveals that the Homeric *hypp.* must have functioned as a model for the *Periochae* of Ps.-Ausonius. Both the *hypp.* and the *Periochae* are closely linked to Homer, as may be deduced from the extent of the summaries, the book-by-book arrangement with the use of first-line quotations, and (concerning the *hypp.*) from the presence of glossaries in the papyri. The writings of Apd., Hyg. and the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (1A), on the other hand, are not directly based on Homer or the Homeric *hypp.* but on a condensed version of Homer. The only connection between the Homeric *hypp.* and scholarship consists of a short remark on the number of days in the *Il.* (cf. **29**), and the use of first-line quotations (cf. p. 2 n. 6). In addition, the glossaries that accompany several Homeric *hypp.* show affinity with lexicographical scholarship.[63] To sum up, the Homeric *hypp.* are closely linked to Homer and have only minor connections with other writings.

As far as the Callimachean *diegeses* are concerned, the majority reproduce the contents of Callimachus' poems and do not seem to be related to other literature. Yet some *diegeses* contain additional information such as the names of the Telchines in **44**, which were not present in the original text.[64] Papyrus **44** thus presents one link to scholarship. Another small link is the presence of first-line quotations in **43-45**, which they have in common with the Homeric *hypp.*, the narrative *hypp.* (p. 1ff.), and the Menandrean prose *hypp.* (p. 39ff.).

The last point for attention is the subject of function and readership. Most Homeric *hypp.* and Callimachean *diegeses* seem to be auxiliary texts: they are not written as replacements for the original poems but rather as introductory or subsidiary texts to be read or used before or together with the Homeric and Callimachean poetry. The Homeric *hyp.* **34** is exceptional because it may have been written in

---

[63] Several glosses resemble those of the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius Sophista, cf. the first editions of **29**, **39** and **42**, and Calderini (1921: 303-326).

[64] For other *diegeses* with additional information, cf. Cameron (1995: 224).

order to supplant Homer, just like the summaries in Apd., Hyg. and the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*. Several papyri enable us to identify their owners: the Homeric *hypp.* **30-33**, **37**, and **39** are written by students or teachers, and pap. **44** with *diegeses* is probably a scholar's text. As the other papyri are written by practised hands, they give no clues about their social context.

To summarize, the *diegeses* form a more coherent corpus than the Homeric *hypp.* with regard to both contents and hands. The large variety within the group of Homeric *hypp.* reflects the diversity of people who wrote and/or used the Homeric *hypp.*, which should not be surprising in view of the fact that Homer was the most read author in antiquity.

CHAPTER THREE

MYTHOGRAPHUS HOMERICUS

1 Introduction

The name Mythographus Homericus (henceforth MH) is generally used to indicate the author[1] of a collection of mythical stories, ἱστορίαι, found both in the Homeric mythographical scholia, part of the so-called D-scholia transmitted in Byzantine mss., and in the papyri printed in Part Two.[2] In contrast to the D-scholia,[3] where the stories are incorporated among other information, the papyri preserve the original form in which these mythical histories were transmitted. They follow the order of the Homeric text, to which they are connected by means of lemmata, (parts of) Homeric verses, sometimes written in ekthesis. Words (often proper names) of these lemmata serve as starting points to tell narratives about mythical persons, their families and adventures, foundations of places, and the origin of insti-

---

[1] The term author is used and not compiler—the latter occurs in Montanari (1995: 165) and the ed. pr. of 53 p. 15—because the collection of the MH does not consist of extracts verbally adopted from previous literature but rather of stories sharing specific characteristics, even though their contents are based on earlier writings. As most catalogues (cf. ch. 4) consist of names that are extracted from previous literature and do not allow us to distinguish a certain style, they will be called 'compilations' written by 'compilers'.

The abbreviation MH is also used in phrases such as 'the MH collection' or 'the MH papyri', instead of the longer 'the collection of the MH' or 'the papyri with texts of the MH'.

[2] Panzer (1892) used the name Mythographus Homericus first. See further on the mythographical D-scholia: Schwartz (1881); Lünstedt (1961); VdValk (1963: 303-413); Montanari (1984: 234-242 and 1995: esp. 135-137).

[3] Hereafter the word 'scholia' is used with the sense of Byzantine/med. D-scholia (or scholia Didymi or scholia vulgata/minora) in order to prevent confusion with the letters indicating the mss. or ms. families containing these scholia. As Montanari's edition of the relevant Iliadic scholia is not yet ready (cf. his report in Montanari 1994: 475), I have made use of several texts. Most *historiae* occur in the AD scholia, that is in mss. A (ed. Ddf. I,II) and D (ed. Lascaris). 'Sch. *Il.*' refers to the text of AD unless otherwise indicated. Some of the *historiae* occur in the bT scholia (ed. Erbse). As to the *historiae* on the *Od.*, I use Ddf. Od. I,II. Information on the mss. can be found in the editions mentioned; see also Montanari (1979: 3ff.).

tutions and habits. Most *historiae* end with a subscription that refers to previous literature. The usual expression is *ἡ* (*δὲ/δ'*) *ἱςτορία παρὰ τῶι δεῖνι*, or, less common, *ἱςτορεῖ ὁ δεῖνα* or *οὕτω*(c) *ὁ δεῖνα*.

The following discussion of the papyri is preceded by a description of the contents, syntax and vocabulary of the *historiae* and is followed by a discussion of the relationship between papyri, scholia and Apd., and by paragraphs on subscriptions, origin and date. A section on function and readership forms part of the conclusions.

2 *Characteristics*

Although several scholars have studied and discussed the mythographical stories, either in the scholia or on papyrus, there does not exist a precise definition or description of these stories which goes beyond the main features mentioned above. In this paragraph I will try to fill in this lacuna. The following description of the syntax, vocabulary and precise contents of the *historiae* will be based on the papyri as they seem to present a more original picture than the scholia.

2.1 Contents

Most *historiae* are short prose accounts of one or more events[4] concerning persons or matters mentioned in lemmata. The events are presented in a chronological order without long descriptions,[5] comments by a narrator, or direct speeches by actors. The *historiae* do not deal with grammar, metre, or matters of textual criticism. The stories are often aetiological (cf. the three stories of **48** where the origin of three names is told) or they explain or elaborate on the Homeric text, see **49**, sch. *Il.* 1, 399, on the rebellion of the gods against Zeus; **50**, sch. *Il.* 9, 447, on Phoenix. Sometimes they combine these characteristics: the story about Helenus and Cassandra in **50** explains the Homeric words *Il.* 7, 44-45 *Ἕλενος ... cύνθετο θυμῶι βουλήν, ἥ ῥα θεοῖcιν ἐφ-*

[4] Event is used with the meaning of the transition from one state of things to another, cf. Bal (1978: 12, and Eng. translation by C. van Boheemen 1985).

[5] Two *historiae* are exceptional as they consist to a large degree of a description: first, **54**, 17ff., a description of the place Callicolone and the derivation of its name; second, the story about Scylla (**56**, 147-156 = sch. *Od.* 12, 85), which is a description of this monster. No event is recorded until the end of this story which is preserved only in the scholia.

ἤνδανε μητιόωσι and it is aetiological because it relates why Helenus and his sister have prophetic gifts. But there are also examples of stories which provide additional information that is not aetiological or explanatory, see e.g. **49** on Caeneus.

There are not only *historiae* about ostensibly obscure names or persons, but there are also stories about people whom or events which we suppose to have been famous and well known. Examples are the stories about Danae and Perseus (see **52**), the expedition of the Argonauts and Phaedra's illicit love for Hippolytus (see **56**).[6] On the other hand, many stories about famous persons are absent although their names occur in Homer, e.g. Alcestis, Andromache and Orestes. It is thus not clear what principle of selection, if any, governed the inclusion of stories.[7] Besides, it is possible that not all the *historiae* have been transmitted to us either on papyrus or in the med. scholia.

The first sentences of stories often give the name of a person followed by information about his/her family and frequently on social position (e.g. king) and/or dwelling place, cf. e.g. **49**, 10 ὁ Καινεὺς Ἐλάτου μὲν παῖς, Λαπιθῶν δὲ βασιλεύς.[8] The length of the stories varies considerably. Whereas the complete story about the Argo and the Argonautic expedition consists of thirty-three lines in sch. *Od.* 12, 69 (cf. **56**, 117-146), the complete story about Phorcys consists of seven lines in sch. *Od.* 13, 96 (cf. **56**, 157-170).

Many *historiae* are self-contained narratives like the narrative *hypp.* (cf. p. 2), others contain words like λέγεται, μυθεύεται and φασιν,[9] which either refer to the tradition in general or to a particular source. These words are found in stories both with and without subscriptions. Every story tells one version of a myth, variants are not recorded.[10] However, this might be due to chance since several scholia contain variants. It is uncertain whether such variants belong to the

[6] More examples occur in the scholia, cf. e.g. Iphigeneia's sacrifice (*Il.* 1, 108), the mad Heracles (*Od.* 11, 269) and Oedipus (*Od.* 11, 271).

[7] It would be interesting to compare the contents of the Homeric *zetemata* with those of the *historiae* and examine possible agreements and differences. Unfortunately, this is beyond the reach of the present study.

[8] See further **48**, 1; **50**, 3, 15-17, 39; **51**, 3; **55**, 12-13; **56**, 29-31, 82-83, 103ff., 118ff., 148-149.

[9] Cf. **49**, 24; **50**, 2-3; **53** fr. 10, 13; **56**, 73, 79, 94-95, 182.

[10] The third story in **49** is concerned with a textual variant (cf. p. 113) but it does not contain variants itself. The words ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν Κλυμένην προγαμηθῆναί φασιν ὑφ' Ἡλίου ἐξ ἧς Φαέθων ἐγένετο παῖς (**56**, 78-80 with supplements from the scholia) give additional information, not a real variant.

original stories or have been added later. Some of them concern proper names or genealogical variants,[11] others give alternative explanations.[12] There are also *historiae* followed by additional information.[13] Only one quotation from Homer is found within a *historia* preserved on papyrus, cf. **53**. Whereas there are no quotations in the *Od.* scholia, the *Il.* scholia preserve several quotations, see sch. *Il.* 1, 5, 264 and 609.[14]

The position of the *historiae* is not determined by the first appearance of the relevant word that triggers the story: the stories about, for example, the Hellespont, the aegis and Aeneas are attached to *Il.* 7, 86; 15, 229 and 20, 307, although these stories could have been connected with lemmata from preceding books, cf. *Il.* 2, 845 (Hellespont), *Il.* 2, 447; 4, 167; 5, 738 (aegis) and *Il.* 2, 820 (Aeneas).[15] This may point to the editing hand of one person, who connected the stories with the most appropriate lemmata, or it may have been caused by the contents of the writing(s) on which the *historiae* are based.

2.2 Syntax and vocabulary

Though single sentences are still most numerous, the amount of compound sentences is larger than in the narrative *hypp.* (cf. p. 7). This is chiefly due to relative clauses. The sentences themselves are connected in a more varied manner including frequent usage of the word *δέ* as well as the conjunctions *μέν-δέ*, *γάρ*, *ὅθεν* and *καί* (especially in **56**), and sometimes the use of the demonstrative *οὗτοc* instead of conjunctions.

---

[11] Cf. e.g. sch. *Il.* 12, 1 Κλειcώνυμον, ἢ ὥc τινεc Αἰάνην. Similar variants with vague references to 'others' occur in sch. *Il.* 1, 38b; 2, 494 (not in ms. A); 4, 319; 5, 392 (not in ms. A); 6, 396; 19, 119; *Od.* 7, 324; 12, 39; 19, 518 (Ddf. Od. II 683, l. 1). The reference in sch. *Il.* 3, 443 is less vague—'Αρμονίδου ἢ κατά τιναc τῶν νεωτέρων Φερέκλου—and sch. *Il.* 1, 7; *Od.* 12, 69 (cf. **56**) and 15, 16 mention the authors who provide the variants.

[12] Cf. e.g. sch. *Il.* 11, 693 ... τὸν Νεcτορά φηcι μόνον περιcωθῆναι ... ἤτοι ... ἢ ... ὥc τινέc φαcιν. See also sch. *Il.* 1, 39; 2, 156-159, 494; 4, 171 and 12, 93, all with vague references to the sources.

[13] Cf. sch. *Il.* 1, 7; 5, 64; 10, 435; *Od.* 21, 295; and n. 10 above regarding **56**. For the subscriptions with precise references to previous literature, see p. 111ff.

[14] On the question whether the quotations found in the scholia really belong to the MH collection, see **49**, and cf. §5.1 on later additions in general.

[15] Other examples are provided by VdValk (1963: 312), who mentions the histories of important heroes that are attached to sch. *Il.* 12 and 13, although those heroes were mentioned in the preceding books as well, cf. sch. *Il.* 12, 1, 93, 292 (= ms. D 397); 13, 1 on resp. Patroclus, Paris, Sarpedon, and Hector.

The finite verbs of the main sentences are indicatives of present and past tense. Most stories show a mixture of them and they seem to be used quite arbitrarily, as can be deduced from a comparison between the med. scholia on the one hand, and the papyri on the other:
52, 21 κτίζει : sch. *Il.* 13, 459 (Ddf. II, p. 22 l. 9) ἔκτισε
56, 61 παρῄνει: sch. *Od.* 11, 322 (Ddf. Od. II, p. 506 l. 14) παραινεῖ
56, 124 ἦλθεν : sch. *Od.* 12, 69 (Ddf. Od. II, p. 534 l. 4) ἔρχεται
56, 131-2 συνεξέπεμψεν : sch. *Od.* 12, 69 (ibid. l. 8) συνεκπέμπει.
Although the stories of the latter papyrus coincide for the greater part with those in the scholia, the tenses still vary. The same variation is found when one compares the passages which the scholia have adopted from Apd. *Bibl.* with the *Bibl.* itself:[16]
sch. *Il.* 1, 42 (Ddf. I, p. 12 l. 25) κατοικίζει : *Bibl.* 2, 1, 4 κατῴκισεν
sch. *Il.* 1, 126 (Ddf. I, p. 24 l. 31 and p. 25 l. 12) γίνεται and ἔθυσε : *Bibl.* 1, 7, 2 ἐγένετο and θύει
sch. *Il.* 2, 105b (Ddf. I, p. 80 l. 8) φυλάττει : *Epit.* 2, 11 ἐφύλασσε.
In the subordinate clauses both indicatives and subjunctives of several tenses and voices, and even an optative (56, 40 γένοιτο, preceding text is lost) occur. Because of the verbs of saying such as λέγεται, indirect discourse occurs more often than in the narrative *hypp.* Whereas attributive participles and those used as substantives are rare, the number and usage of predicate participles can be compared to that in the narrative *hypp.* The genitive absolute is sometimes used in a clumsy way (e.g. 56, 59-61: ἀφειμέν[ης δὲ τῆς Ἀρ]ιάδνης Ἀφροδίτῃ ταύ[τῃ παρας]τᾶσα θαρρεῖν παρῄν[ει]),[17] and two or three participles connected by καί are more often found (e.g. 56, 82-86: Ἀμφ[ιάρα]ος γή-μας Ἐριφύλην τὴν Ταλ[άου καὶ] διενεχθεὶς ὑπέρ τινων πρ[ὸς Ἄ]-δραστον, καὶ π[ά]λιν διαλυθ[εὶς ὤ]μνυεν ... [18]).

Since a wider diversity of subjects is treated compared to the narrative *hypp.* (cf. p. 9ff.), the vocabulary is richer, although on the whole comparable. Two stories contain descriptions of a monster (56, 147ff. on *Od.* 12, 85 Scylla) and a place (54, 17ff. on *Il.* 20, 53 Callicolone) so that many adjectives occur. Elsewhere, there are only a few adjectives, often superlatives, which have a particular function in view of the rest of the story. The amount of adverbs seems to have slightly

---

[16] Cf. also Joannes Pediasimus, *De Herculis laboribus*, a partly altered and abbreviated copy of Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 5, 1ff. Pediasimus often uses a present instead of a past tense and vice versa.

[17] See also 49, 25-27; on this phenomenon, cf. *hyp.* 12 and p. 18, n. 44.

[18] Except for ὤμνυεν, the same text is found in the scholia.

increased, most of them are meaningful. As for negations, *οὐ* occurs a few times and *οὐκέτι* once. The use of pronouns is comparable except for a shift: whereas relative pronouns are used more frequently, the article acting as a demonstrative occurs less often.

Verbal repetition is partly avoided: proper names are replaced by demonstratives, oblique cases of *αὐτόϲ*, and by 'focalizing' nouns,[19] cf. e.g. 56, 100 *τῷ πατρὶ τὴν μητέρα*. Yet there are several unnecessary repetitions. In the story about Phoenix, he is first mentioned by name together with his parents Amyntor and Hippodameia. So, when Amyntor curses him in the second sentence, the repetition of his name (*κατὰ τοῦ Φοίνικοϲ* 50, 42) could have been avoided by the word *υἱοῦ* or *παῖδοϲ*. In 52, 13ff. Aeneas leaves Troy together with his father Anchises, who dies on the way: ... *Αἰνείαϲ ἀποπλέων μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸϲ ... ϲυμβαίνει τὸν Ἀγχίϲην ... τελευτῆϲαι*. Then Anchises is buried by Aeneas, *ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ Αἰνείου*. Whereas such a double indication is very rare in the narrative *hypp.*, it often occurs in the MH stories preserved in the scholia.[20]

Although the subscriptions mention many authors, the phrasing does not modulate with respect to changes in authorship.[21] On the contrary, similar wording and constructions occur in stories which are ascribed to different authors.[22] Cf. the following passages which relate that a god falls in love with a female and makes her pregnant, after which she gives birth to a child who is described with a phrase beginning with a relative or demonstrative pronoun:

> 56, 67ff. on Maera: *τα[ύτηϲ] ἐρα[ϲθεὶ]ϲ Ζεὺϲ ἀφικνε[ῖται] ὡϲ αὐτὴν καὶ λαθὼν φ[θείρει· ἔγκ]υοϲ δὲ γενηθεῖϲα τίκ[τει Λοκρὸ]ν τὸ ὄνομα, ὃϲ* ... (Pherecydes)

---

[19] On this expression, cf. p. 12. An example in which nouns are varied occurs in sch. *Od.* 11, 321 on Procris and Cephalus (this part is not preserved in 56, but the text of this papyrus generally agrees with the scholia): *προϲκαλεϲαμένη οὖν τὸν οἰκέτην ... ὁ δὲ θεράπων* ... Exactly these two nouns were also used in the *hyp.* of the *Iereia*, see 26.

[20] Cf. sch. *Od.* 11, 321 = Ddf. Od. II, p. 504 l. 13 *τὸν υἱὸν Ἱππόλυτον*. Since no other examples are found in the papyrus texts, this could (partly) be due to scholiasts.

[21] This means that the *historiae* cannot be used as evidence for or examples of the style of the authors mentioned in the subscriptions.

[22] Among the examples are stories that do not have subscriptions. We should of course keep in mind that these stories may have mentioned originally one of the authors occurring in the other examples. The authors mentioned in the subscriptions will be indicated between brackets.

53 fr. 10, 14ff. ... Ποσειδῶνα ἐρασθέντα Τιλ[φω]σαίης τῆς 'Ερινύος ἵππῳ ἀπεικ[α]σθέντα μιγῆναι αὐτῇ ἐν 'Αλιάρ[τ]ῳ τῆς Βοιωτίας. τὴν δ' ἔγκυον [γ]ενηθεῖσαν ἵππον γεννῆσαι ... τοῦτον δὲ ... ['Α]ρίονα κληθῆναι.
and cf. the fragmentary 53 fr. 1 (on 18, 432) ... ἡ δ' ἔγκυος γενο[μένη ἔτεκε] παῖδα ὃν καὶ διὰ τὴν [μεταμόρ]φωσιν Φῶκον προσ[ηγόρευσε] (Theopompus); and 53 fr. 11, 10-11 Δία [ἐρασθέν]τα Μαίας τῆς 'Ατλα[ντίδος] after which the text differs considerably (see Part Two).[23]

The same tendency is visible in the following group of passages which are of secondary importance for the present discussion because they are primarily derived from the scholia.[24] These texts introduce men in the same way: name, information on parentage/position/provenance, superlative + τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν/ἑαυτὸν or κατ' αὐτὸν + γενόμενος/ὑπάρξας (once)/ἀνθρώπων (once). This usage of the superlative + τῶν καθ' (ἑ)αυτὸν is not found in Apd. or the *hypp.* to tragedies, comedies or Homer, or in the scholia on Homer and Euripides[25] in contrast to e.g. Demosthenes, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus and Strabo.

1, 264 (= 49, 10-14) ὁ Καινεὺς 'Ελάτου μὲν ἦν (ἦν om. pap.) παῖς, Λαπιθῶν δὲ βασιλεύς ... ἄτρωτος γίνεται, γενναιότατος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν (ἑαυτὸν pap.) ὑπάρξας (no subscription)
7, 8 'Αρηΐθοος ὁ Βοιώτιος, ἄριστος τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων (Pherecydes)
10, 435 does not contain a superlative but is still comparable: 'Ρῆσος γένει μὲν ἦν Θρᾷξ, υἱὸς δὲ Στρυμόνος τοῦ αὐτόθι ποτα-

---

[23] Three of these passages are also found in the scholia: cf. sch. *Il.* 23, 346 with direct discourse: Ποσειδῶν ἐρασθεὶς 'Ερινύος ... ἐμίγη κατὰ Βοιωτίαν παρὰ τῆι Τιλφοῦσαι κρήνηι. ἡ δὲ ἔγκυος γενομένη ἵππον ἐγέννησεν, ὃς ... (Cyclici); sch. *Il.* 24, 24 Ζεὺς ἐρασθεὶς Μαίας τῆς 'Ατλαντίδος, λαθὼν Ἥραν ἐμίγη· ἡ δὲ ἔγκυος γενομένη ἐν Κυλλήνηι τῆς 'Αρκαδίας 'Ερμῆν ἐγέννησεν, ὅστις ... (Eratosthenes); sch. *Od.* 11, 326 ταύτης ἐρασθεὶς Ζεὺς ἀφικνεῖται ὡς αὐτὴν καὶ λανθάνων διαφθείρει. ἡ δὲ ἔγκυος γενομένη τίκτει Λοκρὸν τὸ ὄνομα παῖδα, ὃς ... More passages with similarities can be adduced from the scholia: cf. sch. *Il.* 18, 487 Ζεὺς Καλλιστοῦς τῆς Λυκάονος ἐρασθεὶς ἐμίσγετο αὐτῆι λανθάνων Ἥραν (Callimachus); and sch. *Od.* 14, 533 ... 'Ωρείθυιαν κάλλει διαπρεπεστάτην ... ταύτης δὲ ὁ Βορέας ἄνεμος ἐρασθεὶς λαθὼν τοὺς βλέποντας καὶ φυλάσσοντας τὴν κόρην ἥρπασεν (Acusilaus).

[24] The numbers before the quotations refer to the AD-scholia on the *Il.* unless otherwise indicated.

[25] These are the scholia, primarily scholia vetera, that are incorporated in the TLG-disk.

μοῦ καὶ Εὐτέρπης *μιᾶς τῶν* Μουςῶν. *διάφορος δὲ τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος ἐν πολεμικοῖς ἔργοις* (Pindarus)
11, 1 ... Τιθωνὸν *τὸν* Λαομέδοντος *καὶ* Cτρυμοῦς *τῆς* Cκαμάνδρου *υἱόν*, Πριάμου *δὲ ἀδελφὸν, ἐκπρεπέςτατον τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐν* Ἰλίωι *γενόμενον ἐραςθεῖςα ἀνήρπαςεν ἡ* Ἠὼς (no subscription)
11, 674 Νηλεὺς *ὁ* Ποςειδῶνος, *ἱππικώτατος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος* (Pherecydes)
14, 120 Τυδεὺς *ὁ* Οἰνέως Αἰτωλὸς *μὲν ἦν τὸ γένος, ἀνδρειότατος δὲ τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος* (Pherecydes)
18, 486 (Ddf. II, 171 l. 7-9) Ὑριεὺς *ὁ* Ποςειδῶνος *καὶ* Ἀλκυόνης, *μιᾶς τῶν* Ἄτλαντος *θυγατέρων, ὤικει μὲν ἐν* Ταναγραι *τῆς* Βοιωτίας, *φιλοξενώτατος δὲ γενόμενος*[26] (Euphorion)
23, 660 Φόρβας *ἀνδρειότατος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος* (Cyclici)[27]; see also sch. *Od.* 15, 16 regarding Penelope ... *καὶ τῶι κάλλει καὶ ταῖς φρεςὶ διαφέρει παςῶν τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὴν γυναικῶν* (Philostephanus and Pherecydes)

Both this last section and the features of the *historiae* described in the preceding paragraphs suggest that the papyrus texts go back to one collection of *historiae* written by one particular person, the MH. Such a collection is of course liable to change: certain stories or passages may be added, omitted, altered, or transferred to another position. Whereas the papyri may thus contain *historiae* which were not present in the original collection, it is less likely that two (or more) different collections were created independently of each other.

3 Papyri

48 *P.Hamb.* 3, 199

The handwriting is not described in the first edition, but the plate shows a somewhat irregular, upright, small capital, generally bilinear, assigned to the second century AD. The upper margin is 4 cm. The back side contains a glossary to *Od.* 4 written in the same hand. A paragraphus (below l. 26) indicates the transition to a new lemma. There are several errors, some of which are corrected. No punctuation or lectional signs appear apart from an apostrophe and a diaeresis over *ι*. The lines contain ca. nineteen to twenty-six letters.

---

[26] This example is comparable except for the omission of *τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν*.
[27] The information on parentage, etc. is not present in this example.

The papyrus contains parts of three stories: the first story about Cilla is introduced by a lemma which is the first part of *Il.* 1, 38. The latter part of this verse forms the lemma for the second story about Tenedos of which only the end is present. A complete verse, *Il.* 1, 39 starts the third story on Apollo Smintheus.

The first edition includes an extensive comparison of the papyrus text with the scholia and other comparable versions in the case of the story about Tenedos. Kramer rightly observes that the papyrus (l. 1-10) has a shorter and probably more original text than the scholia because the latter contain many explanatory additions, of which two examples: l. 6 pap. reads Πῖcαν whereas sch. *Il.* 1, 38 have Πῖcαν τῆc Πελοποννήcου (cf. Ddf. crit. app. Πελοποννήcου] λέcβου); 6-7 pap. has *τὸν μνηcτηροκτόνον Οἰνόμαον* whereas the scholia add *αὐτῆc πατέρα* before *Οἰνόμαον*.[28] Apart from the different text of ll. 10-11, we see variation in word order. The rest of this story, as well as the third story (ll. 29-30), is too scanty to be compared. What is left of the story about Tenedos, shows that the papyrus version differs completely from the scholia, which seem to have added much material. In contrast to the scholia, the papyrus preserves a subscription.

49 *P.Oxy.* 3, 418

This papyrus consists of one column of text written in a semi-cursive hand comparable to 27, which is assigned to the third or fourth century AD.[29] Its date is far from certain: although Grenfell-Hunt (*ed. pr.*) assigned the papyrus to the end of the first or early in the second century, the papyrus may be as late as the fourth century AD.[30] The two lemmata, which consist of one Homeric verse, are written in ekthesis, and the second lemma is marked by a paragraphus beneath the line containing the lemma. Lines consist of about thirty-five letters. There are many orthographic errors, some corrections, high stops and one diaeresis over ι.

---

[28] This scholiastic habit of adding explanations to stories is also demonstrated on p. 108, where the stories in the *Il.* scholia derived from Apd. are compared with the text of the *Bibl.* itself.

[29] *Pace* Montanari (1995: 155 n. 5) the papyrus is not lost: it is in Harvard and there is a slide in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

[30] I would like to thank R.A. Coles and J.R. Rea for discussing this papyrus with me.

The first story about Pirithous differs considerably from the scholia on *Il.* 1, 263: the papyrus mentions Heracles in connection with the Centaurs, and the parents of Pirithous, in contrast to the scholia, which explain, on the other hand, Pirithous' name. The second story about Caeneus is rather similar to the scholia on *Il.* 1, 264 except for two sections: ll. 15-16 are not in the scholia and from l. 19 onwards the papyrus is more concise than the scholia which contain explanatory remarks, e.g. instead of Ζεὺϲ δὲ ἀγανακτήϲαϲ Κενταύροιϲ πολεμοῦντα the scholia offer δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀγανακτήϲαϲ ὁ Ζεὺϲ τιμωρίαν τῆϲ ἀϲεβείαϲ παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰϲεπράξατο. μαχόμενον γὰρ αὐτὸν τοῖϲ Κενταύροιϲ. There is no subscription either in this papyrus or in the scholia.[31] After γῆν (l. 22) the scholia cite A.R. 1, 59-64, which is not present in the papyrus. In view of this, Montanari (1995: 156) observes that

> the text of the scholia preserves a more learned and richer version of the MH than this particular papyrus: I think this version was a more ancient one, since it is well known that the citations of the authorities are the first to be lost in transmission of erudite material (as is frequently observed in lexicographical works).[32] It is therefore far more probable that the quotation was originally present and was then omitted in certain copies, rather than being absent originally and added at a later date.

This is only one side of the coin, the other is also sketched by Montanari (1995: 153) in his comment on Haslam's explanation regarding a difference in subscriptions in 50 (see below):

> No connoisseur of scholiastic literature will be startled to find that the editor of the Byzantine corpus or the copyist/user of a manuscript did not hesitate to boldly insert or add material or blend together materials of varying origin or epitomise materials with differing degrees of precision.[33]

Without more evidence, it cannot be concluded whether the A.R. citation originally belonged to the *historia* on Caeneus or not. In contrast to Montanari, I am inclined to regard the citation as a later addi-

[31] Cf. *P.Oxy.* 13, 1611, a work on literary criticism, ll. 38-97 with a story about Caeneus ascribed to Acusilaus the Argive. The text offers no striking similarities.

[32] He compares the transmission of the Homeric lexicon of Apollonius Sophista (167): "at times it is the tenth century codex that presents the richer text and a form closer to the original, whereas at other times it is the exemplar on papyrus. More complex glosses were simplified and among the first elements to be lost were literal citations of authors."

[33] Cf. the examples of added material on p. 106.

tion in view of the absence of comparable quotations in the papyri. On the importance of distinguishing scholia from papyri when discussing the MH stories, see below p. 104ff.

The third story, about the rebellion of the gods against Zeus (cf. sch. *Il.* 1, 399), begins with a lemma and a remark on a variant version (l. 24; cf. scholia on 400) which is explained by the actual story. Such a scholarly remark does not occur elsewhere in the papyri in combination with a *historia*.[34] The story is the same as in the schòlia, but the wording is almost completely different. The scholia are generally more verbose. Between the last two entries the scholia offer stories on verses 268 (Ixion and Centaurs) and 366 (Thebes).[35]

50 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3830 and *P.Lond.Lit.* 142

The London fragment precisely fits in a gap in *P.Oxy.* 56, 3830. The text is written along the fibres in medium-sized, informal, upright capitals of even size assigned to the second century AD. The back is blank. The lines were some thirty-eight letters long, with the lemmata ca. three letters in ekthesis. There are high stops, a possible apostrophe, diaeresis over initial *ι*, an abbreviation, a correction and a line-filler.

Only the middle part of one line is left from the first story (*Il.* 7, 8 - Arithous). The second story about Helenus and Cassandra initially corresponds closely with the scholia on *Il.* 7, 44, but from l. 7 onwards, it seems to be shorter. The third story on the name Hellespont is almost the same as in the scholia (*Il.* 7, 86), apart from some small variations of diction. The remains of the fourth story about Zeus and the Giants (*Il.* 8, 479) and of the fifth about Phoenix (*Il.* 9, 447) are quite different from the scholia. The papyrus also has a subscription at the end of the fourth which is absent in the scholia and instead of *ἡ ἱϲτορία παρὰ τῶι ποιητῆι˙ παρὰ γὰρ τοῖϲ τραγικοῖϲ παρ-*

[34] On this passage, see p. 113 and Montanari (1995: 158-162).

[35] In respect of the latter, I regard only ll. 12-24 (Ddf. I, 49) as belonging to the MH: after l. 24 we find a geographical remark on the number of towns called Thebes. Lünstedt (1961) also enumerates the scholion on l. 334, but its status is doubtful. There is only one sentence (*Ἑρμῆϲ γὰρ μιγεὶϲ Πανδρόϲωι τῆι Κέκροποϲ θυγατρὶ ἔϲχε παῖδα ὀνόματι Κήρυκα, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ τῶν κηρύκων γένοϲ, ὡϲ ἱϲτορεῖ Πτολεμαῖοϲ˙*) of which the style resembles that of the MH. This means that the subscription with Ptolemaeus, who is not mentioned elsewhere in subscriptions, is suspect as well.

αλλάccει,[36] it probably mentions Eratosthenes as source at the end of the last story, cf. l. 48.[37]

Between the story about the Hellespont and the gigantomachy, the scholia contain two *historiae*: cf. sch. *Il.* 7, 468 on Lemnos and 8, 284 on Teucer.[38] It is possible that the papyrus once contained these stories as well, of which l. 22-26 might be the remains.

51 *PSI* 8, 1000

This is an ostracon with the text written in a regular, elegant, upright, angular capital, assigned to the first or second century AD.[39] There are two orthographic errors.

The text consists of an indication of the book,[40] a lemma (*Il.* 13, 217) and part of the first line of a story about Pleuron and Calydon, which is presented in the scholia at l. 218. Salvadori Baldascino, who re-edited the text, thinks that this ostracon might be a mere writing exercise, or that it might contain a note to be elaborated or copied on papyrus.[41]

---

[36] Montanari (1995: 153) prints διαλλάccει.

[37] The reading Eratosthenes is uncertain—cf. *ed. pr.*; Haslam (1990: 34-36); Luppe (1992 *Gnomon*: 292); Montanari (1995: 152-154)—but it agrees with the traces. Haslam (1990: 34 n. 5) gives a plausible explanation of this latter divergency: "In the light of the papyrus' subscription it is clear that the (formally atypical) subscription in A is not a preservation lost in the other parts of the tradition but an addition consequent on the loss of the Eratosthenes subscription." On subscriptions in general, cf. p. 111ff.

[38] Lünstedt (1961) thinks the *historia* on Teucer consists of Ddf. I 283, ll. 8-15, but ll. 11-13 may be an explanatory addition to the original version (on this kind of additions, cf. the comparison between Apd. and MH, p. 109). Lünstedt also enumerates 8, 368 and 369, but both entries are no real *historiae*: the first passage is an interpolation from Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 5, 12—cf. app. crit.: "*Post hoc scholion A addit locum Apollodori 2, 5, 12 ab interpolatore illatum*"—and the second may be part of a MH but it does not relate the reason why the gods swear by the Styx contrary to the story about the Styx in sch. D *Il.* 19, 127.

[39] For the date of this ostracon, cf. Salvadori Baldascino (re-ed.: 259 esp. n. 2): whereas she assigns the ostracon to the first or second century AD, the *ed. pr.* suggests the fourth century.

[40] Similar indications occur in **53** fr. 7 and fr. 11, 8; **56**, 116 and in the Homeric *hypp.*

[41] Cf. Cribiore (1996: no. 183): "Proficient book hand, with finials and letters mostly separated. A teacher or an advanced student."

52 *P.Oxy.* 42, 3003

This papyrus preserves the remains of two columns, written in a round, informal hand assigned to the second century AD with frequent cursive forms. The back is blank. There are some diaereses, stops, occasional accents and breathings, some perhaps by the second hand which made a correction at l. 36. The Homeric lemmata—once part of one verse, twice a complete verse, once unknown—sometimes begin a new line, sometimes begin in mid line. Paragraphi indicate transitions between stories.

After the last line of an entry presumably on Thessalians,[42] the story about the Phlegyae is told in a wording different from the scholia on *Il.* 13, 302, which are far more extensive. This is at least partly due to explanatory additions, e.g. on the lyre of Amphion: *δι' ἧc τοὺc λίθουc ἔπειθεν* pap. : *δι' ἧc κατέθελγε καὶ τοὺc λίθουc, ὥcτε καὶ πρὸc τὴν τειχοδομίαν αὐτομάτουc ἐπέρχεcθαι* scholia. The scholia have a remark on the temple of Apollo (this is only in sch. A, not D) and a subscription, which are absent in the papyrus. The story about Aeneas and Aenea (sch. *Il.* 13, 459) is in general more concise, but there is nothing comparable in the scholia to ll. 19-20. From what is left of the histories of Danae (14, 319) and Amalthea (15, 229), we might conclude that the first was completely different from and far shorter than the entry in the scholia, which is derived from Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1.[43] The second seems comparable.

Between these two entries the scholia relate stories about Alcmene (14, 323-4) and Semele (14, 325).[44] A similar story about Alcmene occurs in sch. *Od.* 11, 266, and the passage on Semele has been derived from Apd. *Bibl.* 4, 3, 2 though the subscription mentions Euripides' *Bacchae*. Between the story about Aeneas and Danae, the scholia have *historiae* on *Il.* 14, 120, 226, 255 and 295. Although all these stories are rather short, it does not seem possible that all of them occurred originally in this papyrus as well.

---

[42] The words Θεcc]αλο[ὶ] *καλοῦντα[ι* in l. 1 are not found in the scholion on *Il.* 13, 301 (Ddf. II, p. 15 ll. 11-17), which I do not regard as a MH story but as a geographical comment.

[43] The same passage is quoted verbally by Zenobius, *Cent.* 1, 41, cf. p. 107.

[44] Lünstedt (1961) mentions sch. *Il.* 14, 338 as well, though this is not a MH story but a comment on the genealogy of Hephaestus: *ἔcτιν τοι θάλαμοc*] *ὅτι ἐκ* Διὸc *καὶ* Ἥραc *καθ'* Ὅμηρον *ὁ* Ἥφαιcτοc. *καὶ νῦν μὲν* ἴcωc *τιc ἐρεῖ ἀμφιβολίαν εἶναι· ἐν* Ὀδυccείαι *δὲ αὐτὸ* cαφῶc *λέγει ὁ* Ἥφαιcτοc. *ὁ δὲ* Ἡcίοδοc *ἐκ μόνηc* Ἥραc.

53 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4096

This papyrus consists of 75 or 76 fragments[45] written in a neat, bilinear, round, upright hand assigned to the second century AD. The back is blank. The scribe has added line-fillers, diaereses over ι and corrections, and has indicated the end of sections by a paragraphus.

The stories are concerned with mythical matters from *Il.* 18 to 24: there are fragments of *historiae* on *Il.* 18, 319 (epithet ἐλαφηβόλος), 432 (Phocus), 486 (Pleiades); 20, 53 (Callicolone), 403-404 (epithet Ἑλικώνιος); 21, 194 (horn of Amalthea), 448 (epithet νόμιος); 22, 29 (Icarius and Erigone), 126; 23, 92 (Achilles' golden vase), 141-142 (sacrifice of Achilles' hair), 346-347 (Arion), 683 (origin of running naked); 24, 24 (Hermes), 602 (Niobe). Indications of books are found in fr. 7, l. 2: τῆϲ Χ; fr. 11, l. 8: τῆϲ Ω and [τῆϲ Υ] should be supplemented in the empty space after l. 3 in fr. 16. The lemmata consist of part of a verse (18, 486), one entire verse (20, 53; 21, 448; 22, 126; 24, 24 and perhaps 22, 29 and 24, 602) or two verses (20, 403-404; 23, 346-347).

This papyrus presents several stories which do not occur in the scholia: fr. 1 on Phocus with subscription; fr. 2 on the epithet ἐλαφηβόλοϲ with subscription; and fr. 11 on the introduction of running naked, with subscription but name lost, is similar to the bT scholia.[46] In view of this and the presence of a precise reference to an author and a quotation within a story, the papyrus seems to be more comprehensive than the other papyri. These have either the same stories as found in the scholia, or part of them, or less.

54 *P.Berol.* inv. 13930 (*P.Schub.* 21)

The text is written on a small stroke of parchment from a codex. The hand, an angular capital of the sloping oval type, is assigned to the fifth century AD. The lemma is written in ekthesis. No punctuation or lectional signs appear.

The text on the front is concerned with Achilles on Scyros, which story occurs in sch. B and D on *Il.* 19, 326. The general contents of the papyrus text are the same as in the scholia, but the wording is completely different, cf. Alfonsi (1953: 299-303) and Luppe (1985 *APF*: 5-11) who mention comparable sources. The back of this parchment has a lemma (*Il.* 20, 53) and the story about Callicolone, which

[45] Not 77 as stated in the *ed. pr.*; cf. Part Two fr. 26 and 65.

[46] Cf. my article (1996: 25).

occurs in scholia bT at the same line and in AD at *Il.* 20, 3. There are small differences in diction.

Line 24 must have contained a lemma since the rest of the text mentions Apollo and δ]εcμοῖc. Montanari (1984: 235ff.) suggests that l. 24ff. contain a story on *Il.* 20, 147, which deals with Zeus who punishes Hera, Apollo and other gods who fought against him (he refers to sch. *Il.* 1, 399 and 49). Yet these lines might possibly tell the same story about Laomedon, his daughter Hesione and Heracles as occurs in a different wording in sch. AD on *Il.* 20, 146 (see **55**): both Apollo (l. 26) and δεcμοῖc (l. 27) occur also in parallel versions, cf. Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 5, 9; D.S. 4, 42.

55 *P.Berol.* inv. 13282

This Berlin fragment is part of a papyrus codex written in a medium size, careful, informal capital, sloping to the right, assigned to the third century AD. The lemma is written in ekthesis. No punctuation or lectional signs appear apart from one diaeresis over ι. Final ν is once abbreviated.

The front side contains parts of a story about Laomedon and Heracles, which occurs in a different version attached to sch. *Il.* 20, 146. The back side presents the end of a story about Aeneas (*Il.* 20, 307), a lemma of two verses (*Il.* 20, 403-404) and a story about Heliconion, which seems to be more concise than that in the scholia.

56 *PSI* 10, 1173

This papyrus consists of seven leaves and one small unidentified and unedited scrap of a papyrus codex written in a cursive hand assigned to the third century AD. There are orthographic errors, some corrections, diaereses over ι and υ, occasional stops, one rough breathing, apostrophes and paragraphi which indicate the end of sections. Only one of the lemmata (*Od.* 3, 91) consists of a complete Homeric verse; *Od.* 11, 321 and 326 are each divided into three lemmata; instead of the complete verse *Od.* 11, 519, we only see τὸν Τηλεφίδην from the middle of the verse, and the last four lemmata consist of about three-quarters of one verse so that they cover one line in the papyrus. Except for the lemma in l. 77, all begin on new lines. Line 116 contains

the letters *οδ μ*, probably the abbreviation of *'Οδ(υccείαc) μ*,[47] to indicate that the following lemma stems from a new book.

This is the only certain papyrus with mythographical stories on the *Od.*: cf. sch. *Od.* 3, 4 (Pylos), 91 (Amphitrite); ? (Telemachus); 11, 321 (Phaedra; Procris), 322 (Ariadne and Theseus), 326 (Maera; Clymene), 519 (Eurypylus), 582 (Tantalus); 12, 70 (Argo and Jason), 85 (Scylla); 13, 96 (Phorcys), 259 (Idomeneus); 14, 327 (Dodona). Whereas the text of the other leaves shows a remarkable resemblance to the scholia, the text of the first leaf is different. The front offers a story on *Od.* 3, 4 followed by a lemma (*Od.* 3, 91). The back side is concerned with Odysseus and Telemachus. The scholia do not contain anything comparable, but it is possible that this story is told on *Od.* 3, 206-207—where Telemachus tells about the insolent behaviour of the suitors—in view of *ὑβρίcαι* l. 21. The text of the other leaves corresponds with the stories in the scholia, apart from small variations in diction and word order, and the following exceptions: the end of the story about Tantalus and the history of Theseus and Ariadne are far more concise in the papyrus which might be due to error. One sentence of the story about Scylla seems to have been omitted erroneously in the scholia, and the end of the tale on Phorcys is different. The scholia offer only a few instances of explanatory additions or simplifications: cf. e.g. pap. l. 155 *τριcτοιχείαν* : *τρεῖc cτίχουc* sch.; l. 160 pap. *'Αρυμνίῳ ... ὄρει* : *τῆc 'Αχαΐαc* add. sch.

In the beginning of the story about Argo and Jason, the scholia on *Od.* 12, 69 give two different versions of the mother of Jason: *Αἴcονοc δὲ καὶ Πολυμήλαc καθ' 'Ηcίοδον γίνεται 'Ιάcων, κατὰ δὲ Φερεκύδην ἐξ 'Αλκιμέδηc*. Hereafter the text continues with *τελευτῶν δὲ οὗτοc καταλείπει τοῦ παιδὸc ἐπίτροπον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Πελίαν, ἐγχειρίcαc αὐτῶι καὶ τὴν βαcιλείαν, ἵνα αὐξηθέντι τῶι υἱῶι παράcχηι. ἡ δὲ τοῦ 'Ιάcονοc μήτηρ 'Αλκιμέδη* ... This part is unfortunately not preserved on the papyrus, but I suspect that the variant in this form was not present in the original version for the following reason: the sentence after the one in which it is told that Aeson dies and asks his brother Pelias to be king and guardian until Jason has grown up, begins with the words *ἡ δὲ τοῦ 'Ιάcονοc μήτηρ 'Αλκιμέδη*. This is rather strange after the sentence with variant versions. Moreover, the transition from the first sentence quoted above to the second with *τελευτῶν δὲ οὗτοc* leads to confusion.

---

[47] This is suggested by Montanari (1995: 146).

57 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 29784 (*MPER* N.S. 1, 17)

This papyrus of good quality consists of two fragments with text only on the front side. The hand is a carefully executed Biblical Majuscule assigned to the third century AD. There is a lower margin of 5.5 cm and the intercolumnar space is about 2.5 cm. The lines are ca. eighteen letters long.

It is uncertain whether this papyrus belongs to the MH collection for there are no lemmata or subscriptions. Fr. 2 tells a story about Otus and Ephialtes who kill each other as the result of a trick of Artemis. Otus and Ephialtes occur in *Od.* 11, 305-320 and the trick is mentioned in the scholia on *Od.* 11, 318.[48] The first fragment only preserves *ογυπαϲ̣[* and some other letters, which have been connected by the editors with Tityus, *Od.* 11, 576ff. In view of this, it has been suggested by Pfeiffer (1937: 16 n. 25) that these remains could be Homeric *historiae*. However, they might also come from another mythographical text, which is not necessarily related to Homer.[49]

4 Comparative survey of papyri

Four papyri stem from Oxyrhynchus, one from Hermopolis and the provenance of the other five texts is unknown. All texts are assigned to dates between the first or second and fifth century AD. Eight texts are written on papyrus, of which **55** and **56** are codices, one on an ostracon and one in a parchment codex (**54**). The back of the four Oxyrhynchus papyri, of **57**, and of the ostracon is blank; the three codices have *historiae* on both sides, and the back of **48** contains *scholia minora* (a glossary) to *Od.* 4. It thus appears that not one text is written on the back of a document, as is the case with the narrative and Homeric *hypp.*

---

[48] A similar story about Otus, Ephialtes and Artemis occurs in sch. *Il.* 5, 385 (not in ms. A).

[49] The history of Otus and Ephialtes occurs in several books in the group of stories about other persons who are punished in Hades: cf. sch. Pi. rec. O. 1, 91; sch. Pi. *P.* 4, 156aff.; Serv. *A.* 6, 582. See also Hyg. *Fab.* 28 and its discussion by Schwartz (1960: 306-314); and Nicephorus Basiliacus (twelfth century; ed. Walz I, 439) 13 Τὸ *κατὰ τοὺϲ* Ἀλωάδαϲ. When Otus and Ephialtes are dead, Pluto punishes them in Hades: *ζηλοῖ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Δία καὶ* Πλούτων, *καὶ γενομένουϲ ἐν* Ἅιδου *κολάζει. μεγάλουϲ γύπαϲ μεγάλοιϲ ϲώμαϲιν ἐπιϲτήϲαϲ, οἳ καὶ τὰ τούτων ϲπλάγχνα πλέον τοῖϲ ῥάμφεϲιν ὑπορύττουϲιν, ἧπερ ἐκεῖνοι πάλαι τὴν* Ὄϲϲαν.

The texts are written in various hands of different typology, size, formality and date, but there are no beginner's hands. Except for **51**, **54** and **57**, all papyri contain some lectional signs: diaereses and/or apostrophes occur in **48-50**, **52**, **53**, **55** and **56**; stops appear in **49**, **50**, **52**, and **56**. The latter also has one breathing and **52** has occasional accents and breathings and corrections by a second hand. Paragraphi occur in **48**, **49**, **52**, **53** and **56**. Two papyri (**50**, **53**) have line-fillers. **52** has one abbreviation probably because the scribe did not want to occupy a new line with the end of one *historia*. Almost all papyri (**54** seems exceptional) contain one or more itacistic writings or other errors, some of which have been corrected.

Eight texts consist of MH stories on the *Il.* One extensive papyrus offers stories on the *Od.*, and **57** has been thought to contain stories on the *Od.* as well. The lemmata that precede the actual *historiae* usually begin new lines, but one lemma in **52** and one in **57** start within the line. Four papyri (**49**, **50**, **54**, **55**) have lemmata written in ekthesis.[50] Most lemmata consist of one Homeric verse, some of two verses (cf. **53** and **55**) and others of parts of one verse (see esp. **56**). The format of the texts is interesting: **57** has ca. eighteen letters per line; three papyri (**48**, **53**, **56**) have ca. twenty-three letters per line, five between thirty-seven and forty-two and the length of **51**, the ostracon, is uncertain. **48**, **53**, **57** and probably **56** have maximum column widths between ca. 6.5 and 7 cm; **49**, **50**, **52**, **54**, **55** have widths between ca. 10.5 and 12.5 cm. There seems to be a kind of division between 'standard' and broad columns. The occurrence of quotations is not the reason for the broad columns because the Homeric *hypp.* contain quotations as well but do not have a similar format. Both the formats and the lemmata written in ekthesis find parallels in learned commentaries or hypomnemata.[51] In contrast to such writings, the MH papyri do not contain critical signs or abbreviations.

---

[50] The only other instances of ekthesis occur in narrative *hyp.* 12, Hom. *hyp.* 42 and list 71.

[51] Cf. e.g. *P.Oxy.* 21, 2307; 35, 2742; 53, 3710 and 3711, for commentaries with a column width between 5.5 and 6 cm, and *P.Oxy.* 8, 1086 and 26, 2451, for commentaries with broad column widths (more than 10 cm). Whereas there exists a study on the format of literary papyri, cf. Johnson (1992), this is a desideratum for the subliterary papyri.

5 Connections between papyri, scholia and Ps.-Apollodorus

The first part of this section concentrates on the differences between the scholia and the papyri with *historiae*. The second part discusses the stories in the *Il.* scholia that are derived from Apd. *Bibl.*

5.1 Comparison scholia - papyri

Before comparing the scholia with the papyri, we should briefly consider the differences between the *historiae* that occur in the scholia.[52] These stories show differences in:
- wording: cf. e.g. AbT on the one hand and D, on the other hand, on *Il.* 5, 126;
- the absence or presence of subscriptions: e.g. the subscription to 20, 215 is not in AT contrary to D; and D has no subscriptions in 9, 447; 13, 217-218; 14, 255;
- their position: A 12, 292 printed in Erbse at line 307 = D 12, 397;[53] A 15, 229 = D 15, 318;
- their occurrence: only A has stories on 1, 59, 108 and 11, 221; in contrast to A, D preserves stories on 9, 557 (different in bT); 18, 10 (also in bT but shorter) and 19, 127.

Similar differences and more occur between papyri and scholia:
- some papyri (cf. **49**, **50** and **52**) do not have stories told in the scholia, **54** has a story with sch. BD in common, one (perhaps two) preserve(s) more stories, cf. **53** and perhaps **56**, the beginning;
- on the divergences in subscriptions, see p. 111;
- apart from minor variations in word order and diction, the text of the scholia is sometimes completely different from that of the papyri. The scholia are usually more extensive, and they have many explanatory additions. These matters can be observed in each papyrus except for **51**, **53**—the scanty remains of both allow no extensive textual comparison—and **56**. The latter, the only certain papyrus with stories attached to the *Od.*, corresponds closely to the text of the scholia.

In short, the stories attached to the *Il.* on papyrus and the stories in the scholia represent different stages of the transmission of the text. In contrast to the scholia, the papyri present a text free from

---

[52] Most stories occur in sch. A and D; a small group is found in bT.

[53] This story is to a great extent comparable to the one found in sch. D and bT on *Il.* 5, 629.

later additions of other scholiastic material. Whether quotations such as the one found in the scholia on *Il.* 1, 264 (but not in 49, see p. 94) once formed part of the original MH collection remains uncertain. Unless proof to the contrary appears, I am inclined to regard the text of the papyri as the most unadulterated representative of what we call the MH collection (cf. p. 92). The importance of distinguishing *historiae* from other material cannot be sufficiently emphasized, which immediately becomes clear when we look at the major studies on the MH.

In his inventory of MH stories in the *Il.* Lünstedt (1961: 56ff.) included many scholia that do not belong to this collection or only partly. Some examples are given so that the reader can compare these contents with those of the MH papyri printed in Part Two. Lünstedt enumerates for example:

- sch. A on *Il.* 2, 585 (Ddf. I 120, ll. 17-21): *Οἴτυλον δὲ ὡϲ δάκτυλον· ἄρχεται γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τῆϲ οι διφθόγγου. κακῶϲ δὲ Τυραννίων, οἰόμενοϲ ἄρθρον εἶναι τὸ οι, καὶ παρὰ τὴν ϲυνήθειαν τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἁμαρτάνων καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἱϲτορίαν, εἴ γε οὕτωϲ φηϲὶ καὶ Φερεκύδηϲ "τοῦ δὲ γίνεται Ἀμφιάναξ· τοῦ δ' Οἴτυλοϲ, ἀφ' οὗ ἡ πόλιϲ ἡ ἐν Cπάρτηι καλεῖται."* This grammatical scholion on the name *Οἴτυλον* only refers to a *historia*.
- sch. DA on *Il.* 3, 175: *παῖδά τε*] *λέγει τὴν Ἑρμιόνην. ὁ δὲ Πορφύριοϲ ἐν τοῖϲ Ὁμηρικοῖϲ ζητήμαϲιν οὕτωϲ φηϲίν. Ἑλένηϲ τε καὶ Μενελάου ἱϲτορεῖ Ἀρίαιθοϲ παῖδα Μαράφιον, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ τῶν Μαραφίων γένοϲ ἐν Πέρϲαιϲ. ὡϲ δὲ Κιναίθων, Νικόϲτρατον. παρὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοιϲ Ἑλένηϲ δύο παῖδεϲ τιμῶνται, Νικόϲτρατοϲ καὶ Αἰθιόλαϲ.* Instead of a coherent story, this is an enumeration of various opinions on the name of the child.
- sch. A on *Il.* 4, 378: *Θῆβαί εἰϲιν αἱ πᾶϲαι τρεῖϲ, ὧν μέμνηται ὁ ποιητήϲ· καὶ μία μὲν ὧν ποιεῖται νῦν λόγον· αἱ Ὑποπλάκιοι, ὧν μέμνηται ἐν τῆι Α καὶ τῆι Ζ, καὶ αἱ Αἰγύπτιαι, περὶ ὧν φηϲὶν ἐν τῆι Ι.* This is not a mythographical but a geographical comment. A similar comment is found in sch. AD on *Il.* 1, 366, cf. Ddf. I 49, l. 24 *τρεῖϲ* - 27 (cf. 49 n. 35). For more examples, see also 49 on sch. *Il.* 1, 264, 334 and 366; 50 on sch. *Il.* 8, 284, 368 and 369; 52 on sch. *Il.* 14, 338.[54]

[54] I suspect that the following scholia enumerated by Lünstedt are not MH stories but other scholia: sch. *Il.* 1, 22; 3, 250; 4, 195, 219; 11, 688, 750; 13, 307 (= D 12, 117); 14, 274, 321 (sch. D); 16, 150, 175; 23, 383 and that 11, 709 (in sch. A; the version in D seems to be MH) and 22, 397 are only partly MH. This enumeration is far from complete. A complete inventory of the precise passages that are MH stories is needed.

Like Lünstedt, VdValk (1963) does not distinguish MH stories systematically from other texts. He regards for instance sch. *Il.* 1, 334; 16, 175, 595 and *Od.* 22, 299 as *historiae*, which they are not.[55] Moreover, in his attempt to prove that the MH stories are written by one specific author, he ascribes some characteristics to the MH which are in reality due to scholiasts: the custom of introducing the stories with the word *ἱcτορία* at the beginning of the scholia on *Il.* 1 (cf. 309-310) and internal references, cf. (312):

> As for the fact that the majority of the histories seems to go back on one and the same author (MH), we may also observe that sometimes the histories refer to preceding scholia, where the same matter has been exposed.

Montanari (1995) who has extensively examined both the D-scholia and the papyri, also does not make a clear distinction between the evidence which the scholia yield and that of the papyri. On the one hand, he observes that (148):

> the papyri preserve what must be regarded as the ancient precursor of the *historiae* of the Homeric D-scholia, i.e. that the *historiae* in D can be traced back to a mythographical commentary on Homer of the imperial age, which is known thanks to papyrus fragments and is called MH.

Likewise, he remarks (166) that most of the MH material probably comes from the Alexandrian tradition, but that materials from different sources may have been added or conflated at varying points in time. As an example he mentions the elements of allegorical interpretation. See also p. 153 where he accepts Haslam's explanation for the difference between the subscriptions found in 50 and the scholia on *Il.* 9, 447 (cf. p. 94).

On the other hand, he uses the presence of learned knowledge in the scholia to support his opinion that the MH collection has a scholarly origin. Although I partly agree with him on this origin (see p. 113ff.), it is unlikely that the scholia represent the original form of

---

[55] On sch. *Il.* 1, 334, cf. n. 35 p. 95; the first part of sch. *Il.* 16, 175 runs as follows: *ὃν τέκε* Πηλῆοc *θυγάτηρ*] *ὅτι* Φερεκύδηc *τὴν* Πολυδώραν *φηcὶν ἀδελφὴν* ᾿Αχιλλέωc˙ *ὀυκ ἔcτι δὲ καθ᾿* ῞Ομηρον *διαβεβαιώcαcθαι. πιθανώτερον οὖν ὁμωνυμίαν εἶναι, ὥcπερ καὶ ἐπ᾿ ἄλλων, ἐπεὶ προcέθηκεν ἂν τεκμήριον τῆc πρὸc* ᾿Αχιλλέα *cυγγενείαc*, and the second part enumerates three possible mothers of Polydora in answer on the question *ἐκ τίνοc* Πηλεὺc Πολυδώραν *ἔcχεν*; the sch. *Il.* 16, 595 is an exposition on the name ῞Ελληνεc, and the sch. *Od.* 22, 299 provides non-mythical information on two members of the species gadfly.

the MH collection so that they can be used as evidence. This can be illustrated with an example: Montanari (1995: 164) contends that the scholion to *Il.* 2, 103 on the epithet *ἀργεϊφόντης*—both the etymological exegesis and the aetiological story with the subscription to Apollodorus—stems together with the etymological explanation of the epithet *διάκτορος*, which is a preceding scholion on the same Homeric line, from

> a unified treatment composed of etymological interpretations and mythological aetiologies on the epithets of Hermes *διάκτορος ἀργεϊφόντης*. This content cannot fail to remind us of the *Περὶ θεῶν* of Apollodorus of Athens.

This statement might hold for the two etymological interpretations but is certainly not valid for the aetiological story; this is a partly abbreviated[56] passage taken from Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 1, 3. We are thus not dealing with part of the MH collection derived directly from a scholarly source, but with the work of a scholiast who has placed etymological interpretations together with a story from a mythographical compendium.

This example brings me to the following observation which is worthy of attention. At all times, we should be very careful in using the scholia as evidence in order to draw conclusions on the original MH collection. Moreover, we must be aware of the possibility that scholiasts have added remarks or stories with or without subscriptions from mythographical manuals or other texts in a style comparable to that of the MH. An example of this is sch. *Il.* 2, 220, a story about the killing of Thersites by Achilles, ascribed at the beginning—a real subscription is absent—to Quintus Smyrnaeus. The date of this author (ca. 180-280) proves that this story or at least the ascription cannot be attributed to the MH (see p. 115). Such obvious evidence is absent in the case of the stories derived from Apd., but I offer the hypothesis that these stories may be later additions to or replacements of the original *historiae*.[57]

---

[56] Cf. the subscription: *ἡ δὲ ἱστορία πλατύτερον κεῖται παρὰ Ἀπολλοδώρωι ἐν δευτέρωι* A (*ἐν τῆι α'* D).

[57] See p. 108ff. for a discussion of the stories in the *Il.* scholia derived from Apd. Diller's suggestion (1935: 297-300) that the *ἱστορίαι* ascribed to Apd. were not taken from the *Bibl.* but from some other collateral text, is based on the discrepancies between the scholia and Apd. and on the supposition that the subscriptions are later additions. On the subscriptions, cf. p. 111ff.; as for the discrepancies, see p. 109. Besides, the scholiasts may have had a richer version of the *Bibl.* than the extant one, cf. Dobesch (1965: 81).

This idea originated from the comparison of the story about Danae transmitted in the scholia on *Il.* 14, 319 with the story that occurs in **52**. The latter is completely different from the former which is derived from Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1 without subscription. Apart from this divergence, not one of the Apollodorean stories is preserved on papyrus.[58] See again **52** where there is no story between the ones on 14, 319 and 15, 229 whereas the scholia on *Il.* 14, 323/4 and 325 record two stories, of which the second about Semele goes back to Apd. 3, 4, 3.

Two more arguments in support of my theory may be adduced:[59] first, most sources mentioned in the subscriptions are ancient poets, historians, mythographers and Hellenistic authors,[60] whereas Apd. is probably to be dated between the first century BC and the third century AD. Second, several other commentators have inserted Apollodorean passages into their works: we find many passages copied word for word in *Ζηνοβίου ἐπιτομὴ ἐκ τῶν* Ταρραίου *καὶ Διδύμου παροιμιῶν ϲυντεθεῖϲα κατὰ ϲτοιχεῖον*, an abridgement of Zenobius' original epitome.[61] Other borrowings occur in Tzetzes' scholia on Lyco-

---

[58] It appears from a comparison between the MH papyri and Apd. that the texts have many subjects in common but that their verbal agreements are restricted to single words and some short sentences. For the most noteworthy correspondences, one may compare **49**, 12-13 and 21-22 with *Epit.* 1, 22 *ϲυνελθόντοϲ δὲ αὐτῆι* Ποϲειδῶνοϲ *ἠιτήϲατο ἀνὴρ γενέϲθαι ἄτρωτοϲ* and *ἐλάταιϲ τύπτοντεϲ ἔχωϲαν εἰϲ γῆν*; **56**, 84-89 with *Bibl.* 3, 6, 2 *γενομένηϲ γὰρ †αὐτῆϲ πρὸϲ* Ἄδραϲτον, *διαλυϲάμενοϲ ὤμοϲε, περὶ ὧν ⟨ἂν⟩* Ἀδράϲτωι *διαφέρηται, διακρίνειν* Ἐριφύλῃ *ϲυγχωρῆϲαι*. Cf. also **52**, 28-29 with *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1 and **56**, 7-9 with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 9. The MH papyri often contain different versions—cf. **53** fr. 11 on Hermes with *Bibl.* 3, 10, 2 or **56**, 29ff. on Procris with *Bibl.* 3, 15, 1—and they are usually more extensive than Apd.—cf. e.g. **50** on Phoenix with *Bibl.* 3, 13, 8; **53** fr. 1 + 2 on the Pleiades with *Bibl.* 3, 10, 1; **56**, 177ff. on Dodona with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 16 where Dodona is only mentioned in passing—although the story of Jason and the Argonauts is shorter in the papyrus, cf. **56**, 122-146 with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 16 and 21-22.

[59] One may argue that the concentration of the Apollodorean stories in the first two books of sch. on the *Il.* is suspect as well. But a similar gathering of stories is found in the case of Pherecydes (nine out of twenty-two—including 19, 518—stories occur in the sch. on *Od.* 11 and 15) and Asclepiades (four out of seven stories are found in the sch. on *Od.* 11).

[60] The papyri preserve the following names: Myrtilus, Hellanicus, Anticlides, Euphorion, prob. Eratosthenes, Theopompus, Socrates, Acousilaus, writers of Thettalica, Demetrius Scepsius, Asclepiades, Pherecydes, Hesiodus, Lycophron.

[61] For the epitome, cf. Von Leutsch-Schneidewin (1965: 1-175) and a short remark in Bühler (1987: 33-34). Robert (1873: 45ff.) and Wagner (1894: xxxviiff.) list the corresponding passages, which are also amply discussed by Dobesch (1965: 58-82). The story about Danae derived from *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1 also occurs in Zenobius 1, 41.

phron: cf. e.g. scholia on ll. 384-386 = *Epit.* 6, 8-12 and the scholion on 1374 resembles *Epit.* 6, 25. Another verbal quotation occurs in med. mss. of Sophocles (LA Ald.), where *Bibl.* 2, 7, 5ff. is offered instead of a *hyp.* of the *Trachiniae.* See also sch. *Tr.* 264 and sch. *Ant.* 981 for references to Apd. (no extensive verbal agreement). The scholia on Plato also contain mythographical stories which are sometimes the same as or related to Apd.[62]

If my suggestion is right that the Apollodorean stories were not present in the original MH collection, this hypothesis would support Montanari's conviction that the text is not based on mythological handbooks (cf. p. 114). At the same time, it would mean that we should be extremely careful in using the scholia as evidence for inferences about the characteristics of the original MH collection. On the other hand, if my hypothesis is not correct, how can we bring the use of a source as Apd. in conformity with the supposed learned origins?[63] Of course, my idea that the Apollodorean stories may be additions and should not be regarded as belonging to the original MH collection, remains hypothetical.

5.2 Scholia and Ps.-Apollodorus

Several stories found in the med. scholia on the *Il.* are (partly) derived from Apd.:[64] sch. *Il.* 1, 42* (an asterisk indicates that Apd. is mentioned in the subscription), 59, 126*, 195*; 2, 103*, 105b, 494*, 547, 595; 8, 368; 13, 307*;[65] 14, 319, 325. It appears from this enumeration that Apd. has not always been mentioned in the subscriptions. VdValk (1963: 306-307) points out that from 2, 494 "onwards Apollodorus is never mentioned again in the subscriptions of D, even though Bibl. has been used by the latter", whereas "in the first part of D, Bibliotheca is always quoted by name in the subscriptions (Apol-

---

[62] Cf. e.g. 588c (*R.*) on Chimaera = *Bibl.* 2, 3, 1 and on Scylla = *Epit.* 7, 20 and on Cerberus = *Bibl.* 2, 5, 12; 25b (*Ti.*) on Aegyptus = *Bibl.* 2, 1, 4; 795c (*Lg.*) on Geryoneus = *Bibl.* 2, 5, 10 and on Briareus = *Bibl.* 1, 1, 1; 796a (*Lg.*) on Antaeus = *Bibl.* 2, 5, 11 and on Cercyon = *Epit.* 1, 3. The following stories are related to Apd.: 215b (*Smp.*) on Marsyas cf. *Bibl.* 1, 4, 2; 23e (*Ti.*) on Erichthonius cf. *Bibl.* 3, 14, 6; 315c (*R.*) on Athamas cf. *Bibl.* 1, 9, 2.

[63] As far as I know, Montanari nowhere discusses this problem.

[64] For this mythographic handbook, cf. p. 25ff. and App. One 1.

[65] 13, 307 in ed. Ddf. = 12, 117 in ed. Lascaris; It does not seem to be a real MH, for it only enumerates Deucalion's children, cf. n. 54.

lodorus)." This conclusion is not completely correct because Apd. is not always quoted by name when used before 2, 494: the beginning of sch. *Il.* 1, 59, which ends with *ταῦτα οἱ νεώτεροι*, is the same as *Epit.* 3, 17, and sch. *Il.* 2, 105b, although without subscription, shows major resemblances with *Epit.* 2, 10-12 which seems to have been abbreviated in some passages.

As to the other stories, 2, 595; 8, 368 and 14, 319 have no subscriptions, but they correspond with *Bibl.* 1, 3, 3; 2, 5, 11 beginning + 12, and 2, 4, 1. The story on 2, 494 closely agrees with Apd. 3, 4, 1 except for the beginning and the end. This seems to tally with the subscription where both Apd. and Hellanicus' *Boeotiaca* are mentioned. The text of 14, 325 is the same as the first part of *Bibl.* 3, 4, 3 but the subscription mentions Euripides' *Bacchae*, a work which relates the same story, cf. e.g. *Ba.* 88-98. How can we explain this divergence? The reference to Euripides might be the last trace of a scholion that has been supplanted by the story from Apd. The same holds for the *historia* on *Il.* 2, 547 which refers to Callimachus' *Hecale* instead of to Apd. 3, 14, 6.

A comparison of the stories in the *Il.* scholia derived from Apd. with the text of the *Bibl.*[66] itself reveals two tendencies. On the one hand, the scholia omit several times additional information or variant versions regarding offspring or parentage found in Apd. A few examples: *Bibl.* 2, 1, 4 and sch. *Il.* 1, 42 both relate that Belus marries Anchinoe, by whom he has twin sons Aegyptus and Danaus. Hereafter Apd. has *ὡc δέ φηcιν* Εὐριπίδηc, *καὶ* Κηφεὺc *καὶ* Φινεὺc *προcέτι*, which is omitted by the scholia. The stories found in sch. *Il.* 2, 103 and 547 also leave out the variant versions given by Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 1, 3 and 3, 14, 6 on the parentage of Io, Argus and Erichthonius. Compare for example *Bibl.* 2, 1, 3 Ἄργου *δὲ καὶ* Ἰcμήνηc *τῆc* Ἀcωποῦ *παῖc* Ἴαcοc, *οὗ φαcιν* Ἰὼ *γενέcθαι.* Κάcτωρ *δὲ ὁ* cυγγράψαc *τὰ χρονικὰ καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν τραγικῶν* Ἰνάχου *τὴν* Ἰὼ *λέγουcιν*· Ἡcίοδοc *δὲ καὶ* Ἀκουcίλαοc Πειρῆνοc *αὐτήν φαcιν εἶναι.* with the short sch. *Il.* 2, 103 Ἰοῦc *τῆc* Ἰνάχου *θυγατρὸc* ... See also *Bibl.* 1, 3, 6 which is strongly abbreviated in sch. *Il.* 1, 195.

On the other hand, many explanations have been added to the stories found in the scholia: e.g. in contrast to *Bibl.* 2, 1, 3, the scholia on *Il.* 2, 103 explain why Argus is called *πανόπτηc*: *ἐπειδὴ κατὰ παντὸc τοῦ cώματοc εἶχεν ὀφθαλμούc*; and instead of only the name Cερί-

---

[66] The *Epitome* will be dealt with below.

φωι found in *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1, the scholia to *Il.* 14, 319 have *Cέριφον τὴν νῆcον, μίαν τῶν* Κυκλάδων. This is also the only story in which the scholia mention a source by name in contrast to Apd. who contains a vague reference: *Bibl.* 2, 4, 1 *ταύτην* (= *Δανάην*) *μέν, ὡc ἔνιοι λέγουcιν, ἔφθειρε* Προῖτος, *ὅθεν αὐτοῖc καὶ ἡ cτάcιc ἐκινήθη· ὡc δὲ ἔνιοί φαcι* ... cf. sch. *Il.* 14, 319 *αὐτὴ* (= *Δανάη*) *δὲ, ὥc φηcι* Πίνδαρος *καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲc, ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτῆc* Προίτου,[67] *ὅθεν αὐτοῖc καὶ cτάcιc ἐκινήθη. ὡc δὲ ἔνιοί φαcιν* ...

The two stories that agree with the *Epit.* of Apd. show that the scholia sometimes preserve more information than the *Epit.* and the other way round: sch. *Il.* 1, 59 offers both parents of Telephus—Τήλεφος *δὲ ὁ* Ἡρακλέους *καὶ* Αὔγης *τῆc* Ἀλέου *παῖc*—whereas *Epit.* 3, 17 only mentions Heracles, though much importance is usually attached to genealogical information. On the other hand, the scholia omit the words underlined in the following text: Τήλεφος ... *cυνεδίωκε τοὺc* Ἕλληνας *καὶ πολλοὺc ἀπέκτεινεν, <u>ἐν οἷc καὶ</u>* <u>Θέρσανδρον</u> <u>*τὸν*</u> <u>Πολυνείκους</u> <u>*ὑποcτάντα.*</u> *ὁρμήcαντος δὲ* Ἀχιλλέως *ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐ μείναc ἐδιώκετο.* The clause underlined is needed to understand the *ἐπ' αὐτὸν* in the following sentence. The same situation is found in the case of *Epit.* 2, 10-12 which agrees to a great extent with sch. *Il.* 2, 105b. It seems reasonable to suppose that part of the text absent in the *Epit.* is likely to have been present in the now lost *Bibl.*

In short, it appears that the scholia do not take as much interest in genealogical data and variants as Apd. but tend to explain names and expressions.[68] Apd., on his turn, also reduces detailed information found in his sources. Söder (1939: 168) describes this process as follows:

> ... Quellenangaben wurden seltener, dafür das Bestreben, eine fortlaufende Sagengeschichte herzustellen, immer stärker. So gingen vermutlich manche der bei Apd. und in seinen Paralleldarstellungen auf *τινεc, οἱ μὲν* und *ἔνιοι* gestellten Erzählungen, wie z.B. ein Vergleich von Apollodors Argonautendarstellung mit den Apolloniosscholien zeigt, in ihren Vorlagen noch unter ihrem Autor.[69]

---

[67] Again, a proper name is explained: *πατραδέλφου*.

[68] It can of course not be discerned in which stage of transmission these changes have been made.

[69] The scholia on A.R. (cf. ed. Wendel 1935) give several times more sources than *Bibl.* See, for example, sch. A.R. 1, 1289 which lists nine sources against *Bibl.* 1, 9, 19 with four sources. Cf. also sch. A.R. 2, 178 with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 21, or sch. A.R. 4, 223-30a with *Bibl.* 1, 9, 24. On the other hand, *Bibl.* 1, 9, 26 offers

Apd. is not the only author who epitomizes previous writings, blends together information from several sources, and thus creates a new heap of easily accessible knowledge.[70]

6 *Subscriptions*

The subscriptions and their reliability have been the subject of many discussions. A survey of these is given by Lünstedt (1961: II-IV).[71] Whereas Schwartz (1881: 458) and Panzer (1892: 56-58) thought that the subscriptions go back to the Byzantines, the papyri have demonstrated that they form part of the *historiae* already in the second century AD. Most subscriptions found in the papyri agree with those in the scholia except for the following differences:
- 48 on Tenedos (*Il.* 1, 38) preserves a subscription in contrast to the scholia.
- 50, the fourth story (on *Il.* 8, 479) has a subscription which is not present in the scholia, and the subscription of the fifth story (on *Il.* 9, 447) is different from the one in the scholia (see discussion in 50).
- 52, the story about the Phlegyae (*Il.* 13, 302) has no subscription in contrast to the scholia.
- 53, there are only two instances where subscriptions can be compared: although fr. 5, the story about Apollo *νόμιος*, does not preserve a subscription, it probably mentions the name Apollodorus in the text (cf. l. 8). The scholia have a subscription with the same name. The subscription found in fr. 10 is slightly different: cf. sch. 23, 142 *ἡ ἱςτορία παρὰ τοῖς* ʼΑργολικοῖς *ςυγγραφεῦςιν* with pap. *ἡ δ' ἱςτορία παρὰ* [*τοῖς* Θεττ]*αλικὰ* ς[*υ*]*γγράψαςι*.

The subscriptions in the papyri mention in most cases one author. There is only one example with two authors, cf. 48, 26 *οὕτως* Μυρτίλος *καὶ* ʼΕλλάνικος.[72] The scholia provide more examples, cf. the subscriptions in sch. *Il.* 2, 145; 6, 35; 12, 292 with two authors, and

---

several variants on the nature of Talos and the cause of his death, whereas sch. A.R. 4, 1646-48 preserve only one notice which mentions Sophocles.

[70] Cf. p. 157f. for compendia and the literature mentioned in n. 68 p. 154.

[71] See also VdValk (1963: 303ff.) and Montanari (1995: 141ff.).

[72] This subscription may be interpreted as follows: thus Myrtilus, who follows Hellanicus. Cf. Naber in the Prolegomena to his edition of Photius' lexicon (1864: 10) "*Sic* Θέων *καὶ* Δίδυμος *significat: Theo secutus Didymum, Theo qui utitur testimonio Didymi, Didymus apud Theonem.*"; and Schmidt (1854: 289).

sch. *Il.* 3, 242 with three authors. The scholia also have examples in which the author's name is accompanied by the indication of a specific book and/or volume, cf. e.g. sch. *Il.* 3, 75; 6, 155; *Od.* 11, 287 and 321b. The *historiae* usually have subscriptions which refer to authors who lived in the pre-Christian era, cf. n. 60. It is very complicated to get a clear picture of the relationship between the sources and the *historiae* for most of the sources mentioned are lost. Since this problem goes beyond the scope of my research, I can only present the current opinion that the subscriptions should not be regarded as real sources to which the *historiae* go back, but rather as references to authors who deal with the same subject. Sometimes the complete story, other times part of the story, a particular detail, or only the subject seems to have been told or mentioned by the author found in the subscription.[73]

There is no internal or external evidence about the function, usage or purpose of the subscriptions. The following observations are therefore provisional, but they are offered to provoke further thoughts on this subject. As pointed out in the previous paragraph, the subscriptions seem to act as a reference. In view of this, we may ask the following question: what kind of readers would make use of these references? In other words, who was able to consult the authors listed in the subscriptions? The only persons for whom those subscriptions would have had any value were readers who had access to a large collection of literature. But when these readers were in the position of consulting the authors, it is likely that other kinds of commentaries and also more learned ones were accessible as well. It would have been far easier for them to use these commentaries with precise references, citations, etc. instead of trying to find a certain passage, of which they only knew the author and in some cases the specific work and/or book. I therefore think that the subscriptions were not used by readers to obtain more information on the subject. They have no actual function.

This evokes the question of why the subscriptions exist. How is their presence to be explained? It seems unlikely that they have been

[73] Cf. Lünstedt (1961), esp. 15-23 on the subscriptions to Lycophron, and 35-36 with conclusions; VdValk (1963: esp. 342ff.); Montanari (1995: 154ff.). The conclusions of these authors are chiefly based on the *historiae* found in the scholia (cf. p. 104ff.). There remain nevertheless several subscriptions in the papyri that yield the same conclusions.

added by someone to the *historiae* to make a learned impression.[74] Since the references are in general reliable in the sense given above, they must go back to someone who was truly learned and thus had no need to create a scholarly impression. The subscriptions are therefore more probably the last traces of a work (or more than one)[75] in which stories were related together with variant versions and references to sources. However, this scenario only puts the problem in another light: we now have to explain why the subscriptions are not omitted—a question about which we can only guess. It is possible that the subscriptions have been kept in order to anchor the *historiae* firmly into the literary tradition.[76]

7 Origin

Except for what we may extract from the papyri and scholia, we have no information about the nature and origin of the MH collection. In order to determine the nature of this work, it is necessary to take the connection with the Homeric text into account. The *historiae* may go back either to a work already connected with the Homeric text or to an independent work which displayed a different principle of arrangement or to works of both types. There is one example of a *historia* which is likely to go back to a learned commentary on the Homeric text. The story found in 49 after the quotation of *Il.* 1, 399 ὁππότε μιν ξυνδῆσαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤθελον ἄλλοι begins with the words γράφου-

[74] VdValk (1963: 305ff.) argues that the MH prefers to mention a famous or obscure author instead of a common manual such as Apd. *Bibl.* in order to make a learned impression. One may be inclined to compare the ascriptions that were written in the margins of Parthenius' Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων and Antoninus Liberalis' Μεταμορφώσεων συναγωγή, but these are different, as VdValk rightly observes on p. 304: they are later additions made around the middle of the third century AD by one or more scribes. Many studies discuss the origin and reliability of the ascriptions, cf. Wendel (1932: 148-154) on Sellheim (1930); See further on ascriptions and sources regarding both Parthenius and Ant. Lib.: Hercher (1877: 306-319); Oder (1886); Blum (1892); Rohde (1914³: 123-126); Blumenthal (1949: 1895-1899); Papathomopoulos (1968: Introduction XV-XIX); Forbes Irving (1990: 20-24); Lightfoot (forthcoming, cf. Introduction n. 8).

[75] In the following discussion the word 'work' implies the addition 'or more than one'.

[76] A comparable attitude is perhaps found in Call. fr. 75, 54ff., fr. 612 and *Lav. Pall.* 5, 56, where Callimachus points out that his subject matter has been dealt with by predecessors, cf. Bulloch (1985: 161-162).

cί τινες "καὶ Φοῖβος 'Απόλλων". We know that this was Zenodotus' reading instead of Παλλὰς 'Αθήνη in verse 400 Ἥρη τ' ἠδὲ Ποσειδάων καὶ Παλλὰς 'Αθήνη. The *historia* which tells how Poseidon, Hera and Apollo revolt against Zeus, thus supports Zenodotus' textual variant. It is the only story that elucidates a textual problem since the connection with the Homeric text is generally more difficult to establish (cf. p. 86).

However, this is not the only learned trace: **53** offers a *historia* which explains the origin of the epithet νόμιος applied to Apollo. Although the subscription is lost, Apollodorus of Athens is probably mentioned in the text and one verse of Homer is cited as an illustration. More evidence of connections with a scholarly work is not preserved in the papyri. All the other examples adduced by Montanari (1995) such as the presence of quotations and variant versions, are derived from the scholia. On account of these examples, he assumes a scholarly origin (166):

> my overall assessment is that we can be reasonably sure that the material contained in the MH must not be viewed as deriving from a fairly late and low-level mythographical compendium, based merely on indirect manualistic knowledge. On the contrary, it appears to me that there is strong evidence that somebody made a selection from high-quality learned commentaries of the Alexandrian age, thereby producing this mythographical commentary to Homer, which was transmitted in later centuries in a number of versions.[77]

In view of this conclusion, two matters have to be observed: first, one should be more careful in drawing conclusions based on evidence only provided by the *historiae* in the scholia, since part of that material might have been added by scholiasts (cf. above). Second, it is doubtful whether we can really exclude the utilization of a "low-level mythographical compendium" in addition to the use of a learned commentary or more than one. Why could the MH[78] not have used a work like Apd. *Bibl.* which includes more variant versions and references to sources (cf. e.g. *Bibl.* 2, 2, 2 and 2, 3, 1) than the MH stories themselves (cf. p. 109)?

To conclude, the *historiae* may all be based on a scholarly work with or without the use of intermediaries, but the remains of such an

[77] For the learned origin of the MH collection and for the connection of the subscriptions with the *historiae*, see also Arrighetti (1977: esp. the conclusion on p. 66).

[78] Cf. p. 92 on the MH, the author of the collection of *historiae*.

origin are meagre and appear only in a few papyri. Instead of offering variant versions of entire stories or of certain details together with the names of the sources and perhaps quotations or other learned material (cf. above for some exceptions), the *historiae* usually give one version and they refer to other works only in the subscriptions at the end omitting other scholarly matters. This procedure of simplification might explain the differing connections between subscriptions and sources (see above, p. 112) as well: sometimes the source that was fortunate enough to be mentioned in the subscription, may indeed have been the main source for the version of the story related; at other times, it might have been one of the sources that was originally mentioned to account for a particular detail.

8 Date

As to the date of the MH collection, VdValk (1963: 313-314) concludes "Though, as we see, we have no absolute certainty on this point, we must reckon with the possibility that MH is not to be dated earlier than the second century A.D." He arrives at this statement also in view of the manuals of Apd., Ptolemaeus Chennus (active around 100 AD) and Ps.-Eratosthenes which would have been used by the MH. Apart from the question whether Ps.-Eratosthenes' *Cat.* has really been used by the MH,[79] the material (possibly) derived from the manuals appears only in the scholia. This means that we have to fall back on the evidence which the papyri provide.

Papyri **48**, **50**, **52**, and **53** have all been assigned to the second century and the ostracon **51** to the end of the first or early second century AD. The early date of **49**, which has always been regarded as the most ancient papyrus (assigned to the first or second century AD), is to be doubted (cf. **49**). So, we might conclude tentatively that the MH had completed his work as early as the end of the first century AD. An earlier date cannot be excluded but is as yet not confirmed by any evidence. A terminus post quem is provided by a subscription in **54** which refers to Demetrius Scepsius (ca. 200-130 BC). The papyri show that the collection of *historiae* was copied separately from the Homeric text or other scholia during the following centuries from the first or second to the fifth century AD. The time of its incorpora-

[79] On this issue, cf. VdValk (1963: 313) who refers to Maass (1883: 6ff.; 59).

tion in the scholia is uncertain, but the collection seems to have undergone minor and major changes at all stages of transmission.

9 Conclusions

To end this chapter, I will try to formulate answers to the following three important questions: what kind of information is transmitted in these papyri and how is this done? How are the contents of the papyri related to other literature? What do we know about the function and readership?

To start with the first question, the MH papyri preserve parts of a collection of mythical stories appended to Homeric lemmata in which the occurrence of a particular person or place gave rise to the story. The lemmata, which are written in ekthesis in four papyri, and stories follow the order of the Homeric text like a commentary. Although this arrangement suggests a close link with scholarship, the contents leave some room for doubt: on the one hand, the MH collection preserves some learned material, subscriptions, and a considerable number of stories that present rare or obscure information, see the examples enumerated below. On the other hand, the stories relate one version of a myth without variants and refer to previous literature only in the subscriptions (apart from one exception in 53), though remarks such as λέγεται occur within the stories. In short, the MH seems to have been a scholar who adopted his stories from learned writings, perhaps from intermediaries as well, and presented the reader with one particular version. The MH collection makes the deeper reading of earlier writings on the same subjects unnecessary.

The information transmitted in the papyri does not only show a link with scholarship but also with the mythographic handbooks of Apd. and Hyg. These books have many subjects in common with the MH stories, although the latter contain far more obscure and rare stories that are mentioned only incidentally or are absent from Apd. and Hyg. Examples are the *historiae* on Smintheus (48), the birth of Pirithous (49), Helenus and Cassandra (50), the epithets ἐλαφηβόλος, Ἑλικώνιος, and νόμιος, Achilles' golden vase and the sacrifice of his hair (53), Maera, Eurypylus, and Phorcys (56).

Whereas the correspondences between Apd. and the *historiae* in the papyri are restricted to similar subjects and rare verbal similarities (cf. p. 107 n. 58), the med. scholia incorporate several *historiae* which have been verbally adopted from the *Bibl.* (for the precise relation-

ship, see p. 108ff.). One obvious difference between the two collections is their distinct organization of the material. In Apd., the stories form part of an independent book which is a continuous, genealogically arranged, telling with clear signs of its narrator. Contrary to the MH stories, variant versions are often recorded and introduced both by vague remarks as λέγουϲιν and by precise references to sources.

So much for the MH papyri and their relationship with other literature. We will now explore questions of function and readership. It appears from the presence of lemmata, sometimes in ekthesis, and some indications of books (cf. **51**, **53** and **56**) that we are concerned with a kind of commentary that follows the Homeric text step-by-step. Thus, the MH collection was originally meant to be read or consulted together with Homer. This is also likely in view of **48**, the back side of which contains *scholia minora* to *Od.* 4 written in the same hand. This papyrus was probably used by someone who needed help while reading Homer. The other papyri do not give clues to their usage. The presence of part of one *historia* on an ostracon (see **51**) shows that the MH collection was probably known by a broad public.[80]

The later incorporation of the MH stories in the scholia suggests that there was a need for such mythographical stories which explained the Homeric text or provided background information. We learn from some rhetorical handbooks that one of the tasks of teachers was to provide information on the personages or other matters occurring in the poems which they read, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1, 8, 18

> *his accedet enarratio historiarum, diligens quidem illa non tamen usque ad superuacuum laborem occupata. Nam receptas aut certe claris auctoribus memoratas exposuisse satis est;*

> In addition to this he will explain the various stories that occur: this must be done with care, but should not be encumbered with superfluous detail. For it is sufficient to set forth the version which is generally received or at any rate rests upon good authority.[81]

---

[80] Cf. Montanari (1995: 139).

[81] The translation is by Butler (1958). Colson (1924: 114) comments upon the word *historiarum*: "The word as used in the schools covers any information which is required or given about the personages, etc., in the poems, or any explanation of allusions. 'Historiae' are classified as *τοπική*, *χρονική*, *περὶ τὰϲ πράξειϲ*, *περὶ τὰ πρόϲωπα* (Sext. Emp. *adv. gramm.* 3, 270) ... According to another classification they were divided into (1) *μῦθοι*, legendary matter, (2) *πλάϲματα*, fictitious but possible matter as in comedies, (3) *ἱϲτορία* (in a limited sense) really

Quintilian's text is in harmony with the MH stories, which relate one version of a myth without variants and refer to an authoritative text in their subscriptions.

In addition to this primary function—the explanation of the Homeric text—the collection could have been read for its own sake. It is less likely that people (for instance, poets, cf. the section on Parthenius on p. XIV) have used the collection as a kind of source or reference book for mythical stories. Even if one knew Homer extremely well and thus knew where specific persons or places are mentioned in that text, the MH collection would have been very difficult to consult for the stories are not systematically told at the first occurrence of a name (cf. the examples given on p. 88). Not until many centuries later does evidence appear which points to such a usage: the first part of the prolegomena which have been added to cod. Vat. Gr. 32 (R)[82] consists of a numbered index of *historiae* and other matters such as *hypp.* The numbers correspond to numbers written in the margins of the scholia themselves. As Montanari (1979: 82ff.) points out, this is obviously an instrument through which the MH stories could be read and used on their own, that is without the Homeric text. To summarize, we have only med. proof that the MH collection may have functioned as an independent mythographical compendium. Papyrus evidence suggests that the MH stories were primarily used as a mythographical commentary on Homer.

The kind of readers who used such a commentary cannot be deduced from the papyri. We may only recall that not one text is written on the back of a document and that all texts are written by experienced hands. There are no obvious school or scholars' texts, though **51** may have been written by a teacher or advanced student while **52** has occasional accents and breathings, and corrections by a second hand. To conclude, the MH collection was probably not read and copied by school boys who began studying literature, but we cannot exclude an educational context or usage by scholars, writers or other people who read Homer.

---

historical matter, Sext. Emp. *ib.* 272." As regards to *historiae* in education, see also Cic. *de Or.* 1, 187; Juvenal. *Sat.* 6, 450 and 7, 230-1; Jacobs (1899: 1ff.); Marrou (1948: 230ff. and 375); Bonner (1977: 237-238).

[82] This codex of the twelfth century contains D-scholia without the Homeric text. See Montanari (1979: 79ff.), for a discussion of this codex and the prolegomena dated by him to the beginning of the fifteenth century AD.

CHAPTER FOUR

CATALOGUES

The present chapter starts with an introduction to the types of catalogues in the papyri, which are thereafter discussed in §2 and 3. The next section is concerned with Hyg. *Fab.*, a handbook with comparable catalogues. Suggestions on function and readership are offered in the conclusions.

1 Introduction

The tradition of catalogues or lists is very old and widespread: from Homer and Hesiod onwards, Greek and Latin literature includes a large number of catalogues of varying length and contents, both in poetry and prose.[1] This chapter will only deal with papyri which contain one or more mythographical prose catalogues, sometimes in combination with a mythical story or other non-mythical list(s). In general, other lists are not included, such as historical lists of writers or philosophers, catalogues of books,[2] lists of fish, birds or rivers,[3] chronological lists of priests, officials, and so on. School exercises enumerating gods or other matters are also excluded when they are obviously composed to learn reading and writing.[4] Papyrus **68** is included because the second part consists of a list of inventors of military equipment and pioneers of strategies in which many mythical persons and events are mentioned.

The papyri appear to contain two types of catalogues: first, catalogues that are originally based on one poetical passage or work; sec-

---

[1] An extensive survey of all kinds of catalogues is given by Regenbogen (1950: 1408-1482).

[2] See for this kind of texts *CPF* I.1 (1989: 81-114): "liste di filosofi ed elenchi di opere".

[3] Examples are enumerated by Harrauer-Sijpesteijn (1985: 105).

[4] Some examples: the schoolmanual *P.Cair.* inv. 65445 (= Pack 2642) and *P.Mich.* inv. 2458, edited by Priest (1977: 193-200), who refers to other comparable lists. See also Marrou (1948: 233-234); Début (1983: 261-274) and Cribiore (1996: no. 98-128). The description of Pack 2725, "catalogue of deities, with reference to Iliad xx", is somewhat misleading: it is not a list of gods but part of a kind of summary of *Il.* 20, cf. Hom. *hyp.* 37.

ond, catalogues that consist of enumerations of certain creatures, phenomena or events, which were once mentioned in different sources. The clearest example of a catalogue that closely follows the contents of a poem occurs in **58**. Other catalogues also enumerate persons that occurred in earlier poetry, such as Argonauts or Greek leaders against Troy, but the lists mention the persons in a different order, and they may contain material that is not found in the original poetical source. In these cases, it is probable that the lists are not based directly on the poetry, but rather on a separate study, a learned commentary or an excerpt or a summary of this type of writing (cf. e.g. **60** and **61**). The precise relationship between lists and previous literature is typically difficult to establish since many texts have not been preserved.

The catalogues of the second type reflect a scholarly, systematizing or encyclopedic mentality due to which material on certain subjects was assembled from different sources, organized, excerpted, expanded, and so forth. Some of these lists seem to be new compilations (cf. e.g. **72**), others are concerned with subjects that were once discussed by famous scholars such as Aristotle or Apollodorus of Athens (cf. e.g. **67**). Since many catalogues are concerned with εὑρήματα, I will briefly review this subject. Heurematographical literature is concerned with inventions and discoveries in the broadest sense. This includes things celebrated, done, built or made for the first time. Likewise, founders of cities, legislators, artists, etc. may also be regarded as inventors. Some examples of texts that comprise heurematographical catalogues are:[5]
- Hyg. *Fab.* 225 *Qui primi templa deorum constituerunt*, 274 *Quis quid inuenerit*, 275 *Oppida qui quae condiderunt*, 277 *Rerum inuentores primi*;
- Plin. *Nat.* 7, 191ff. with all kinds of inventions;
- Aelianus *VH* 3, 38 on inventions by the Athenians;
- Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 16 on all kinds of inventions; cf. **77**, where eight men are mentioned who have written books on inventions. See also other Christian writers, e.g. Tatianus Assyrius *Or. ad Graecos* 1, Gregorius Naz. *Or.* 4, 107-108;
- *Marmor Parium* (put up in 264/3 on Paros) mentions all kinds of colonisations, discoveries and new institutions arranged not on subject but chronologically;[6]

---

[5] For more information see Eichholtz (1867); Kremmer (1890); Wendling (1891); Kleingünther (1933); Regenbogen (1950: 1466-1472).

[6] See *FGrHist* 239. Cf. Jacoby's commentary (p. 668): "ganz sicher benutzt ist ein buch Περὶ Εὑρημάτων."

- *P.Hib.* 2, 186 verso (Pack 2449) preserves scanty remains of a text dealing with inventions and inventors, but there are no indications that point to the nature of a catalogue.[7]

The order in which the papyri are discussed is more or less determined by their contents: papyri **58-66** contain one or more catalogues that have connections with earlier poetry, such as Hesiod, Homer, A.R. or lost poems; **67-69** display primarily heurematographical subjects and **70-74** have various contents. The description of each papyrus is followed by a discussion of the contents and references to comparable lists in order to determine the position of the papyrus lists in the literary tradition. These references do not pretend to be exhaustive; they merely serve to give the reader the main *comparanda*. For more information on the mythical catalogues or characters, the reader may consult the editions of the papyri, the *RE* or the more recent *LIMC*, where each entry contains a survey of literary sources and a bibliography.

2 *Papyri*

58 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4308

The text is written along the fibres in an informal, round hand with a number of ligatures, somewhat similar to the hand of **70**. The papyrus is tentatively dated to the second century AD. There is a lower margin of 1.4 cm. Lectional signs do not appear. There are two orthographic errors. Each entry begins a new line.

This fragment preserves the latter part of a list of children of goddesses and mortal men, which corresponds to the persons mentioned in Hesiod, *Th.* 975-1018.[8] Each entry probably consists of the elements goddess, mortal man, and child or children. Whereas the names of children are put in the acc. in ll. 1-2, ll. 3ff. present nomina-

[7] The relevant text (fr. a back) runs as follows: . . . .]ν̣υ[. . . .] . . . ν̣ διωρθωμε̣[| ὄ]ν̣τ[α] μὲν π[ρ]ῶ̣τ̣ο̣ν̣ εὑρετήν . [| κ]α̣θεωρ̣ή̣κ̣α̣μεν ὃς πρῶτος . [|] . ι̣ησιολογίας ἐνστησαμεν[| .] . ο̣ α̣ὐτ̣ὸ̣ς εὗρεν γράμμασι̣[|]τὸ γράμμα ἑκαστ[| traces of four more lines. Haslam (private note) wonders whether χρηστολογίας can be read in l. 4.

[8] This part belongs to an expanded version of the original *Theogony* as composed by Hesiod, cf. West (1966: 48-49 and 397-399). The papyrus seems to be based on a text which did not contain 1014, left out by some mss. and testimonies, cf. critical apparatus in OCT.

tives. If the supplements of Μηδείας in l. 6 and of Ἀφροδίτης in l. 9 are right, the compiler replaced the poetical *κούρην δ' Αἰήταο* (*Th.* 992) and Κυθέρεια (*Th.* 1008) with these common names.

As the other lists on papyrus differ considerably from their ultimate sources, the close correspondance of this papyrus text with the underlying poetry is unique. This might mean that catalogues were still compiled directly from the original texts in the second century AD. Yet we cannot exclude intermediaries.

The list of unions between goddesses and mortal men without offspring in Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 33, 8-9 and Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 4, 27 have three couples in common with this papyrus; Hyg. *Fab.* 233 *Quae immortales cum mortalibus concubuerunt* may have comprised similar entries but is lost. See also Hyg. *Fab.* 270 *Qui formosissimi fuerunt*; 271 *Qui ephebi formosissimi fuerunt*, where some of the same couples occur as well. For more unions between gods and mortals, cf. 64.

59 *P.Haun.* 1, 7

This papyrus comprises the lower parts of two columns of writing. It is distinguished both by the quality of the papyrus, a large bottom margin (5.7 cm), and by the careful and beautiful script. The text is written along the fibres in a carefully formed rounded upright capital, bilinear (except *φ* and sometimes *ρ*) with serifs on many letters. The back is blank. The papyrus is assigned to the first century AD. There are two curved paragraphi and punctuation is by blank spaces. Lines have ca. eighteen letters. The first editor observes that the contents are not in line with the beautiful appearance. He thinks the text may be part of a mythographical compendium comparable to Apd. *Bibl.* or part of a book on Troy, such as written by Dictys Cretensis and Dares Phrygius.

According to the editor, the first column contains a story about Philoctetes. This is likely in view of ἕλκος *κατ̣[ὰ]* Τ*ροί-* (l. 4).[9] As for *πεπρω[ται/μενος* or something similar (l. 10), cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 102. 3 ... *quibus postea responsum est sine Herculis sagittis Troiam capi non posse.* However, the text may deal with one or two other mythical episodes, such as about Telephus who was wounded and healed by Achilles and in his turn showed the Greeks the way to Troy. Although Tele-

[9] Philoctetes' wound is mentioned in e.g. *Il.* 2, 723; Apd. *Epit.* 3, 27; *Cypria* = *Procli Cypriorum Enarratio*, ed. Davies (1988: 32, l. 65ff.); Hyg. *Fab.* 102; and Dictys 2, 14.

phus does not occur in Homer, his history is often found in proximity to the story about Philoctetes.[10] Since the passages on Telephus cited in n. 10 not only mention a wound and an oracle or prediction, but also the guidance of Telephus (cf. l. 5 ἡγεμὼν), this hero has perhaps more chance of being the subject of this story than Philoctetes. Besides, ll. 9-11 may be concerned with Protesilaus and the oracle give to the Greeks that the first of them to land from the ships would be the first to die.[11]

The second column presents a small part of a catalogue of ships. The three data of this list—leader, homeland and number of ships (written in full; once νῆαϲ is added)—vary in order of presentation. The entries are written continuously. The words τοὶ 'Αϲκληπιάδαι and φηραθεο̣ [are curious and do not occur in Homer. The transcript of l. 19-20 (beginning) in the *ed. pr.* is Φήραθε Εὔ[μη]λοϲ ἔνδε-] | κα, but this is based on what the editor wants to read: in view of the *Il.* and the other catalogues (cf. below) we expect the presence of Eumelus from Pherae; yet ε̣υ̣[cannot be read (cf. the text in Part Two). Besides, Φήραθε or Φηρᾶθε[12] is not attested elsewhere, neither Φέραθε (but cf. *Il.* 2, 711 Φεράϲ and 763 Φηρητιάδαο). I also wonder whether the small space between φηρα and θεο̣ [is meaningful: should we perhaps divide these letters in a poetic φῆ ῥα θεο̣ [which concludes the enumeration? Against this option speaks the following line with κα Βοιωτων and the more likely connection between φηρα and Pherae.

In order to establish the place of this papyrus catalogue in the tradition of ship-catalogues, this list will be compared with the Homeric catalogue[13] and the prose catalogues that are based on Homer.

---

[10] Cf. *Cypria*, *ib.* l. 48ff.: Τήλεφοϲ ... ὑπὸ 'Αχιλλέωϲ τιτρώϲκεται ... Τήλεφον κατὰ μαντείαν παραγενόμενον εἰϲ Ἄργοϲ ἰᾶται 'Αχιλλεὺϲ ὡϲ ἡγεμόνα γενηϲόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ; Hyg. *Fab.* 101 *Telephus ... hasta percussus dicitur. ex quo uulnere ... petit sortem ab Apolline ... Achiuis autem, quod responsum erat sine Telephi ductu Troiam capi non posse, facile cum eo in gratiam redierunt et ab Achille petierunt ut eum sanaret.* See also Apd. *Epit.* 3, 17-20; Dictys 2, 3 and 10ff.

[11] I owe this suggestion to M. Haslam. Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 103 *Achiuis fuit responsum, qui primus litora Troianorum attigisset periturum*; Apd. *Epit.* 3, 29-30; *Cypria* ed. Davies (1988: 32, l. ?); Tzetzes *H.* 2, 759.

[12] Cf. Haslam (1986: n. 3) who remarks that the Doric form Φηρᾶθε "would seem to point to a lyric source. Perhaps Stesichorus?"

[13] There is one other poetical catalogue of ships, which shows more differences than resemblances with Homer, viz. E. *IA* 231-302, a lyric catalogue with only a dozen leaders, who are not always the same as those in Homer. The number of ships is not always given or it differs. Verses 192-231 enumerate several

Between this oldest list and the later lists lies a vast range of intermediate literature of which we only have some fragments and testimonies. Cf. Haslam's remark (1986: 32): "Apollodorus of Athens, *On the Catalogue of Ships* lies far behind;[14] Hellanicus, Damastes, and Aristotle's *Peplos*,[15] further still." Like Haslam, we should be very careful in assuming closer relationships between these older works and the papyrus catalogues or, for instance, Hyg. *Fab.* 97.[16] But let us now consider the catalogues still extant:

The Homeric catalogue (*Il.* 2, 494ff.) does not enumerate the Greek leaders, their homelands and the numbers of ships in a strict order. On the contrary, in addition to these elements, we find much other information, for instance on persons, places or events. The fathers of the leaders are not always mentioned. Compared to the Homeric catalogue the papyrus first enumerates four leaders in a reversed order (irrespective of the contents of l. 19, cf. above), viz. Polypoites, the Asclepiads, Philoctetes and Protesilaus whereas *Il.* 695-747 presents Protesilaus, Eumelus (not present in the papyrus?), Philoctetes, the Asclepiads, Eurypylus (not present in the papyrus) and Polypoites. Then, the papyrus reads *Βοιωτῶν*, whose leaders occur right at the beginning in Homer. So, the order of leaders differs considerably from the Homeric catalogue and there is one difference in the number of ships;

- Apd. *Epit.* 3, 11-14. This catalogue offers the following information in this order: group of people from a specific area,[17] leader, father, and number of ships,[18] for example, *Φεραίων* Εὔμηλος 'Ἀδμήτου ια'. Compared with the Homeric catalogue, some sections are sum-

---

Greek leaders present in Aulis. Some of them recur in the catalogue of ships. For a more extensive survey of ship catalogues, see Allen (1921: 22ff.).

[14] Cf. *FGrHist* 244 F 154-207 = Περὶ τοῦ νεῶν καταλόγου and Pfeiffer (1968: 257-259) on Apollodorus' book, which was a detailed commentary on *Il.* 2, 494-759. There is no resemblance between the contents of the Apollodorean fragments and the other catalogues.

[15] Cf. the following testimony (quoted more extensively by Rose, ed. 1967: 394): Eustathius in Hom. Il. (β, 557) p. 285: ... *ἱστορεῖ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Πορφύριος καὶ ὅτι 'Ἀριστοτέλης σύγγραμμα πραγματευσάμενος, ὅπερ ἐκλήθη πέπλος, γενεαλογίας ἡγεμόνων ἐξέθετο καὶ νεῶν ἑκάστων ἀριθμὸν καὶ ἐπιγράμματα εἰς αὐτούς* ... Of these items, only the epigrams have been preserved, cf. Rose (1967) fr. 640.

[16] An example of the contrary is provided by Wendling (1891: 39), who argued without having firm evidence that *Fab.* 97 goes back to Aristotle's *Peplus*.

[17] Only once we see the name of a place instead of the inhabitants: *ἐκ Φυλάκης*.

[18] At the beginning of the list the form *ἦγε ναῦς* x' prevails, later *ναῦς* x' or only x'. The father is sometimes not mentioned or together with the mother.

marized,[19] there are a few omissions of leaders and some differences in the number of ships. The information on parentage provided by Apd. is not always present in Homer;

- Hyg. *Fab.* 97 *Qui ad Troiam expugnatum ierunt et quot naues.* The pattern of data is: leader, parentage,[20] proper name or adjective denoting origin, *nauibus* plus number x. Example: *Eumelus Admeti et Alcestis Peliae filiae filius a Perrhaebia, nauibus VIII.* Hyg. differs considerably from the Homeric catalogue. It shows a different order of leaders with many additions and information on parentage not found in Homer, plus differences in the places assigned to the leaders, and it is more precise in the number of ships: whereas Homer tells that the Boeotian Peneleus, Leitus, Arcesilaus, Prothoenor and Clonius bring fifty ships, Hyg. mentions each man with a number of ships: Peneleus 12, Leitus 12, Clonius 9, Arcesilaus 10, and Prothoenor 8. The additional information found in Apd. and Hyg. (and cf. 60 below) must have been derived somewhere from post-Homeric literature, for instance from the learned works mentioned above. Yet it is not asserted that the other catalogues go directly back to the *Il.*;

- Dictys Cretensis 1, 17. Most times we find the elements—leader, proper name or adjective denoting origin, number of ships[21]—in this order, but it also varies. Example: *XI Eumelus Pheraeus.* Compared to the *Il.*, we find the same numbers and places, but the leaders are listed in a different order and four have been added at the end;

- Dares 14. The elements are presented in a fixed order: leader, homeland (*ex* + proper name), number of ships. Example: *Eumelus ex Pheris cum nauibus numero X.* Compared with the *Il.*, Dares shows a different order of leaders with a few additions and omissions, and several errors in numbers of ships.

To conclude, the papyrus catalogue is most similar to Dictys because it does not contain additional information, the order of leaders differs from the Homeric order and the three elements of the list are not presented in a fixed pattern. It might be possible both in view of the differences and the poetical words that this catalogue is derived

---

[19] E.g. instead of giving the names of the Boeotian, Orchomenian and Phocian leaders, Apd. only mentions their numbers and the numbers of their ships.

[20] Both the father and mother are usually mentioned and the mother's father occasionally. Sometimes another means of identification is used, e.g. *Automedon auriga Achillis.*

[21] The number is sometimes accompanied by the words *naues, nauium instructam classem,* or *nauium classem.*

from another poetical source than the *Il.* The papyrus text might be part of a summary or paraphrase of a poetic text on the Trojan war, in which the catalogue plays a minor role.[22] This seems just as likely as the possibility that the text consists of a separate story and list. In spite of this conclusion, the papyrus is incorporated here because the catalogue seems, at first instance, to be the main constituent. Besides, the papyrus is frequently mentioned in literature on mythical lists.

60 *P.Oxy.* 53, 3702

The text, which was originally of some length—fr. 1 col. II is numbered ρκβ = 122—, is written on the back of a roll of accounts in an irregular and ungainly plain round and upright hand which may be assigned to the latter part of the second century or the earlier part of the third. A paragraphus below and a blank space in l. 29 separates the first list from the second. High and middle stops separate entries within the lists. There are diaereses, one apostrophe, some spelling errors, final ν is abbreviated and iota adscript is occasionally written. The lines are about twenty-four letters long.

This papyrus contains parts of three lists and one story with no connection to each other. Haslam (*ed. pr.*) suggests that we are dealing with fragments of a mythological handbook of the same type as Hyg. *Fab.* The first list, a catalogue of the Greek leaders against Troy, presents three items: Greek leader, father, and homeland (ἐκ + proper name) always presented in this order. This list is basically that of the Homeric catalogue (*Il.* 2, 494ff.), but there are various cases of omission, addition and sequential disruption. The most remarkable feature of this list is the absence of the numbers of ships. The Greek leaders, whose paternity is always mentioned in contrast to the habit in the *Il.*,[23] were apparently more important than the fleet. This list shows most resemblances to those in Apd. and Hyg., that is, the type with additional information (cf. 59 above).[24]

[22] Cf. Hom. *hyp.* 37: a summary of *Il.* 20 including a list of gods.

[23] Cf. ll. 5-7 with *Il.* 2, 645-652 on Idomeneus and Meriones. Apd. and Hyg. also include the paternity.

[24] Although most names of fr. 1 occur also in catalogues of suitors of Helen—cf. Apd. *Bibl.* 3, 10, 8; Hyg. *Fab.* 81; Hes. fr. 196-204—the link with the Homeric catalogue of ships is more probable in view of the similar entries and their order.

The second list, introduced by a heading, deals with the suitors of Penelope. It is very short and enumerates only the place of origin[25] and number of suitors (see ll. 30-34). Though the order of the entries is different, the information closely corresponds with *Od.* 16, 247-252, in which the last entry on the suitors from Ithaca is followed by other men who were present in the palace.[26] The papyrus' list of suitors includes Medon the herald and the bard, here mentioned by name (Φήμιος ᾠδός), but not the attendants. It is remarkable that the bard is provided with a name, for it is not present in the Homeric text at this place.

Apd. *Epit.* 7, 26-30 gives a more extensive list, which adopts the Homeric order but must have been derived from another source as it adds the names of all the suitors, whose numbers differ from those in the *Od.*[27] An example: *Epit.* 7, 28 *ἐκ δὲ Cάμηc κγ'* · 'Αγέλαος Πείcανδρος Ἔλατος, *κτλ.* Medon and Phemius are not mentioned.

The second list is followed by a history of the Danaids introduced by a kind of heading (*Δαναοῦ - ἀπέκτεινεν*) and the remark *καὶ διὰ - προεκθήcομαί coι.* The last two words are remarkable and commented upon by Haslam:

> An unexpected element is the incorporation of personal address in the Danaid story, *προεκθήcομαί coι* fr. 1. 37f. Is this *tibi lector*, or does it point to an actual dedicatee? The manuscript could in fact be an autograph. Only with such derivative material as this one can scarcely speak of authorship.

In the first case, these words may have been adopted from the source on which this story is based.

The story is written in simple prose. There are merely single sentences with aorist and imperfect indicatives, of which two contain a circumstantial participle (nom.). Two conjunctions occur, *καί* and *γάρ*. In view of the heading and the *προ(εκθήcομαί)* it is probable that this story is merely an introduction to a list of Danaids together with Aegyptids whom they killed. Comparable literature is:

---

[25] Probably omitted in l. 31, cf. Haslam: "Before ιβ̄ I should have expected ἐξ 'Ιθάκηc."

[26] Cf. *Od.* 16, 251-253 *ἐκ δ' αὐτῆc 'Ιθάκηc δυοκαίδεκα πάντεc ἄριcτοι, | καί cφιν ἅμ' ἐcτὶ* Μέδων *κῆρυξ καὶ θεῖοc ἀοιδὸc | καὶ δοιὼ θεράποντε, δαήμονε δαιτροcυνάων.*

[27] The numbers given in Apd. do not always agree with the numbers of names listed: we see 53 and 41 names instead of the 57 and 44 announced beforehand by *ἐμνῶντο ἐκ Δουλιχίου μὲν νζ'* and *ἐκ δὲ* Ζακύνθου *μδ'*. These discrepancies might be due to a scribal error: *νζ* instead of *νγ*, and *μδ* instead of *μα*.

- Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 1, 5ff. This story includes a list of unions between Danaids and Aegyptids;
- Hyg. *Fab.* 168 *Danaus* and 170 *Filiae Danai quae quos occiderunt*, a story and list of Danaids/Aegyptids, which is almost completely different from the Apollodorean list;
- the Danaids seem to have occurred in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, see frr. 127-129; cf. Schwartz (1960: 366-369).

The third list is a catalogue of Argonauts which consists of three elements: Argonaut, father, and homeland (ἐκ + proper name), always in this order. So, it is very similar to the first list. The following poetical and prose catalogues may be compared:
- three catalogues from poetic texts which do not show a bare list or fixed pattern: A.R. 1, 23-227, Val. Flacc. *Arg.* 1, 353-486, Orph. *A.* 119-230. According to Allen (1921: 26) "The Argonautic Catalogues in Valerius Flaccus and Orpheus are for the most part copies of that in Apollonius. Occasionally they provide a variant.";
- four prose catalogues: the *prolegomenon* C of sch. A.R. (ed. Wendel 1935: 4-6): Argonaut plus father (= fixed pattern); Apd. *Bibl.* 1, 9, 16: Argonaut plus father (= fixed pattern). This list shows many differences in sequence and participants mentioned; Hyg. *Fab.* 14: we usually find the elements Argonaut, father, mother, mother's father, proper name or adjective denoting origin. The information on parentage is sometimes shorter and variants, stories (cf. Caeneus) or other details are often added; the list of Argonauts in **61** (see below and cf. *ed. pr.* of **61** p. 48 for more lists).

It appears that Apd. and sch. A.R. always mention the Argonauts' fathers in contrast to A.R. 1, 23-227, and that Hyg. adds even more information on parentage and other matters. As to the lists of Argonauts themselves, these are almost identical in A.R., sch. A.R. and Hyg. The papyrus list has the same items as the one in **61**, which means that both have more information than sch. A.R. and *Bibl.*, but less than Hyg. The order of names in this list differs from that in all the others.

61 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4097

This papyrus consists of several scraps with parts of a catalogue of Argonauts and other lists. The hand is a medium to small, upright rounded capital assigned to the mid-second century AD. The back is blank. No lectional signs appear except for diaereses. There are several instances of itacism, cf. l. 5 and 7: Εἴφικλος and Εἴφιτος occur

among names beginning with iota. As Fowler (*ed. pr.* 49) remarks, the itacism presumably indicates that the man who wrote this copy was not the man who alphabetized the list.

The first fragment contains part of an alphabetically ordered list of Argonauts. This list seems to have the same items as 60—Argonaut, father, and homeland—but the three items are aligned vertically so that there are three successive columns. This layout is not repeated in other papyri. The alphabetical order is disrupted in ll. 10-11, where two entries with π- occur among names with κ-. A comparison with the other catalogues of Argonauts shows that many Argonauts in this range of alphabet (θ-κ, π) are lacking and that there are some remarkable agreements with Hyg. *Fab.* 14. Four names occur only in this list and in Hyg.: Thersanor, Iolaus, Priasus and Phocus.

Fragment 2 presumably contains some parts of a list of Calydonian boar-hunters: the extant entries consist of hunters in alphabetical order with their fathers. There is no close agreement with the following catalogues of boar-hunters, though the papyrus and Hyg. *Fab.* 173 share some rarities (cf. *ed. pr.*): the François vase (c. 565 BC; on the inscriptions of the boar-hunt, cf. Wachter (1991: esp. 86-95); E. fr. 530 Nauck, *Meleagros* (four names of hunters); Paus. 8, 45, 6-7; Apd. 1, 8, 2; Ov. *Met.* 8, 299ff.; Hyg. *Fab.* 173 *Qui ad aprum Calydonium ierunt.* More lists and secondary literature are mentioned in the edition of this papyrus.

Fragment 3 has five names of fathers: they might belong to the catalogue of Argonauts or to a list of competitors at the games of Pelias. Fragments 4-7 are not identified.

62 *P.Duk.* inv. 752 (*P.Robinson* inv. 10)

This papyrus is not published, but there exists a description made by Willis (1968: 74) and another description and image are now accessible on the World Wide Web.[28] The text is written across the fibres in a practised hand assigned to the second century AD. There are traces of ink on the other side. Entries are written continuously. There are some orthographic errors and lines contain some seventeen letters.

The remains of the first column are not identified. The second column seems to contain two lists, of which the first is an asyndetical

[28] Cf. http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/752.html. The following observations and the transcript in Part Two are based on the WWW image and on examination of a photograph.

enumeration of mythical men presumably connected with the Calydonian boar-hunt. Entries do not start new lines. The first five entries consist of the names of men (nom.) and their fathers (gen.), and the others have an adjective denoting provenance instead of the fathers' names. Many men are not attested as boar-hunters in the catalogues mentioned in **61**.

The first catalogue seems to end in l. 16, the latter part of which, εὐψυχότα[τοι], may either conclude this list or belong to what seems to be an indented heading in l. 17. The second catalogue, from l. 18 onwards, enumerates famous heroes and their parentage beginning with Heracles. A comparable catalogue might have been Hyg. *Fab.* 268 *Qui fortissimi heroes fuerunt* (lost).

63 *P.Stras.* W.G. 332

The text is written along the fibres in a practised hand of the mixed type with a slight slant to the right. It is assigned to the second half of the second century AD. Entries are separated from each other by small blank spaces. Some itacistic errors occur. The lines carry ca. fifteen letters.

The first column of this papyrus offers two names of Muses, their children and the fathers of their children, followed by a list of victors in the games held for Pelias, which also occupies the second and part of the third column. The two entries of the first list preserved in lines 2-7 show the pattern: name - μοῦϲα - man (dative) τῷ father (gen.) - ἐξ ὧν/ἧϲ - son (once plus γίνεται). Before comparable catalogues of Muses are listed, we should ask whether the complete list enumerates only Muses or other mothers as well: the first line seems to contain the name Nausithous, but a link between a Muse and Nausithous is not attested.[29] One may also wonder whether the word Muse would have accompanied the womens' names if the catalogue consisted exclusively of Muses. The remains of this papyrus are too scanty to solve this problem.

Comparable to the entries with Muses are five prose catalogues:[30]

- Apd. *Bibl.* 1, 3, 2-4 is not a real list since it includes stories about Orpheus and Thamyris and other short notices on persons involved. Only five muses are mentioned together with their men and children;

[29] Nausithous may be a son of Poseidon and Periboea, cf. *Od.* 7, 56, or a son of Odysseus and Calypso, cf. Hes. *Th.* 1017 and pap. **58**, or a son of Odysseus and Circe, cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 125.10.

[30] See **58** and **64** for unions between immortals and mortals.

- sch. (D) *Il.* 10, 435 enumerates the children (nom.) and mothers (gen.) sometimes with a variant version, example: *Λίνοϲ Τερψιχορῆϲ ἢ ὥϲ τινεϲ Εὐτέρπηϲ*. Only once is a father mentioned. There are seven entries;
- Tzetzes on Hes. *Op.* 1 (ed. Gaisford 1820: 24-25). A complete list with the Muses, their children and husbands. Many variants are included: e.g. *Οὐρανίαϲ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ, ἢ Πιέρου γηγενοῦϲ, Λῖνοϲ*;
- Ps.-Dositheus (cf. Rose 1933: 174) shows a complete list with nine muses, their arts, husbands and children, enumerated in a fixed pattern: e.g. *Κλειὼ κιθάραν. μετὰ Πιερίου. ἐγεννήθη Ὑμέναιοϲ*;
- fr. 146 (sch. E. *Rh.* 346) of Apollodorus of Athens (*FGrHist* 244), a list with nine muses (gen.) and their children (acc.), e.g. *Οὐρανίαϲ μὲν Λίνον*. Fathers are not mentioned. However, we must remember that the original could have contained more information than is now present, since this fragment does not contain the words of Apollodorus himself.

Apart from the differences in extra information on fathers or arts, the catalogues show many different combinations of Muses and children. If we only look at these couples, the two entries of the papyrus agree with fr. 146, Tzetzes and Ps.-Dositheus. In contrast to fr. 146, the three other lists mention the fathers of the children. As Tzetzes mentions two different fathers, the papyrus is most similar to Ps.-Dositheus who names the same father in the case of Hymenaeus, but a different one for Linus.

The list of victors in the games held for Pelias is introduced by the words *Ἐν τοῖϲ Πελίου ἄθλοιϲ ἐνίκηϲαν*, after which the victor, father, and contest are enumerated.[31] The enumeration is once interrupted for a short remark on an accident. The list, including this accident, is almost identical with part of the seventh list in 69 (ll. 91-103). The only difference between 69 and this papyrus is the order of Castor and Calais. Hyg. *Fab.* 273, 10-11 contains the same catalogue with the order of 69, but it differs from the papyri in the parentage of

---

[31] A comparable pattern of elements is found in *P.Oxy.* 2, 222 and 23, 2381, two papyri with historical lists of Olympian victors written by the same scribe in the middle of the third century AD, and *P.Oxy.* 17, 2082, a chronological compendium which first mentions the victors of the Olympian games of a specific year and then the historical events belonging to that period. The scribe of *P.Oxy.* 222 and 2381 writes each entry on a new line, cf. e.g. *P.Oxy.* 222, col. I, ll. 7-8 *οϲ* [*Cκά*]*μανδροϲ* Μυτιληναῖοϲ ϲτ[*άδιον*˙ | Δά]ṿδιϲ Ἀṛ[γ]εί[ο]ϲ *δίαυλον*˙ (instead of the father of the victor, we find an indication of origin.) Because of this layout, this list is easier to consult than those in *P.Oxy* 2381, 63 and 69.

Castor and Pollux, and is largely different in the part from Bellerophon onwards (63 19ff.). But it does include the remark on the accident. A different list occurs in Paus. 5, 17, 9-10, where a description of the Chest of Cypselus is given. According to Willis (1941: 392-417), these catalogues ultimately go back to some early epic source which dealt with the funeral games for Pelias. There are no remnants of such a work but we do have some lyric fragments of Stesichorus' Ἆθλα ἐπὶ Πελίαι (*PMG* frr. 178-180).

Instead of transcribing the text of col. III, Schwartz (*ed. pr.* 156) only writes:

> Col. III. La liste des vainqueurs semble aller jusqu'à la l. 6 où se trouve un blanc; elle était donc plus longue que celle de l'Hygin actuel. On ne peut identifier que *Οἰάγρου* au début de la l. 3. Les l. 6 à 9 (au moins) concernent très probablement Europe, fille d'Agénor. Après le blanc déjà signalé, lire: Ε [. . . . . Α] | [γ]*ηνω*[*ρ* . . . .]*δα μανθ*[. . . . .] | Ευ*ρωπη*[(cf. *Bibl. Apoll.* III, 3).

A photograph of this papyrus shows considerably more text in columns II and III than Schwartz describes, cf. the text in Part Two.

64 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 3, 126

The text is written in a practised, angular, mixed style hand, slanting to the right, assigned to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century AD. There are some small serifs, finials, abbreviations and corrections. Ca. twenty-five letters are written per line. The back is blank. Paragraphi indicate transitions between the entries.

This fragment offers a list of Zeus' liaisons with mortal women and their offspring. The women are enumerated in alphabetical order. Ll. 5-9 show a fixed pattern: woman (dative) - (*τῇ*) father (gen.) - ἐξ ἧϲ - son(s). The surrounding lines seem to add information about some of the persons mentioned. The entries are usually connected by *καί*.

The following discussion is restricted to extant catalogues of unions of Zeus with mortal women (for other lists of unions between immortals and mortals see below), cf.:
- *Il.* 14, 317-325 mentions five mortal women and their children;
- Isoc. *Hel.* 59 mentions unions of four women with Zeus. Children are not included;
- Ps.-Clem. *Recogn.* 10, 21-23 and *Hom.* 5, 13-14 are long alphabetical catalogues which include both women and offspring. The papyrus text closely corresponds with parts of these lists;

- Ov. *Met.* 6, 103-114 is a poetical, non-alphabetical, catalogue and it enumerates nine unions of women with Zeus, which also occur in Ps.-Clem. Offspring is not mentioned;
- Arist. *Apol.* 9: a list of unions of Zeus with women and hereafter a list of the children born after these unions. See also later Christian writers: Firm. *De err. prof. rel.* 12, 3ff.; Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 4, 26; Ps.-Tert. *De execr. gentium diis* 6-7.

It seems that the Ps.-Hesiodic catalogues have been the ultimate source for lists of all kinds of unions between gods themselves and between gods and mortals.[32] Some of these catalogues have been rearranged alphabetically, as appears from the almost identical papyrus text and Ps.-Clem. In view of this, the second editor, Salvadori (176), thinks the papyrus text might be a copy of the handbook that was used by Clem. Al. and Ovid, which must have been a reference book perhaps destined for school use.[33]

For comparable catalogues with other unions, see **58**, **63** and e.g.:
- Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4 F 19a and b. F19b (= *P.Oxy.* 8, 1084) offers a list of the liaisons of nymphs and gods and their offspring;
- Aristotle's *Peplus* seems to have incorporated a section on the loves of several gods, see Rose (1967: 394) for a testimony (= Socr. *h.e.* 3, 23);[34]
- Philodemus' Περὶ εὐϲεβείαϲ contains a list of liaisons of Apollo with women;[35]
- Hyg. *Fab.* 226-233: lists of women who slept with Jupiter, Apollo, Neptunus, Mercurius, Liber, Mars and Aquilo, and one catalogue of goddesses who slept with men. All are lost;
- Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 32-33 and Ps.-Clem. *Hom.* 5, 12, 15-17; *Recogn.* 10, 20: unions between several gods and mortals;
- Ov. *Met.* 6, 115ff.: unions of Neptunus, Apollo, Bacchus and Saturnus.

65 *P.Med.* inv. 123

This papyrus shows one column of text with the end of a list of Actaeon's dogs and the beginning of a list of monsters. The text is writ-

---

[32] Cf. Schwartz (1960: 281ff.); Luppe (1984 *BCPE*: 109-124); West (1985: 1-7).

[33] This opinion is based on James (1932: 262-265) who suggests that Ps.-Clem. used a textbook of mythology as source; see also Rose (1932: 382-383).

[34] Mainly on account of this testimonium and in view of the comparable lists in Clem. Al., Wendling (1891: 32ff.) argues that Hyg. *Fab.* 226-232 are likely to go back to the *Peplus* as well. This conclusion is highly hypothetical and has not been confirmed by evidence. Cf. n. 53.

[35] Cf. Luppe (1984 *BCPE*: 109-124) and West (1985: 1-7) who both discuss *P.Hercul.* 243 III, part of Philodemus' Περὶ εὐϲεβείαϲ.

ten on the back of a document in a formal mixed hand, angular, sloping to the right, assigned to the end of the second century AD. It has an abbreviation of documentary origin (l. 13) and a lower margin of at least 4 cm. The headings are written in the middle of new lines, and the description of each monster starts at a new line. There are two line-fillers, and no lectional signs. The lines are ca. eighteen letters long.

The first list enumerates Actaeon's dogs, the names of male dogs, followed by *γίνονται* $\overline{\kappa\theta}$ and *θήλειαι αἵδε*, which introduces the list of female dogs ending with *γί(νονται)* $\overline{\iota\eta}$. Other lists of dogs occur in:[36]

- A. *TrGF* 3, fr. *245 = Poll. *Onom.* 5, 47 mentions only four names;
- Apd. *Bibl.* 3, 4, 4 includes only seven names in a passage of hexameters which has probably been interpolated;
- Ov. *Met.* 3, 206-233 (thirty-six names);
- Hyg. *Fab.* 181 contains two catalogues of dogs, divided into male and female. The first is derived from Ovid, the second from other authors, cf. 181. 5 *item alii auctores tradunt haec nomina.* The list in the papyrus is in substantial agreement with the second Hyginean list.

The second list, which is introduced by *τάδε* - *μυθολογεῖται*, presents and briefly describes two monsters, Hydra and Chimaera. Except for the word *μυθολογεῖται*, which might either refer to a particular source or to the tradition in general, the list is self-contained. Instead of Daris' supplemented text ['Η χ]ώρα ἐν Λυκίαι πῦρ ̣ ̣ [in l. 19, I propose to read [Χίμα]ι̣ρα κτλ. which would not only fit the space and the traces (cf. the text in Part Two), but would also yield a more suitable reading.[37]

---

[36] For names of dogs, cf. Bäcker (1884); See Renner (1978: 282-285) on the possibility that the Hesiodic Catalogue will have treated the history of Actaeon at some length. Cf. Grilli (1971: 354-367) who examines the connections between this papyrus and the following literature.

[37] In the first place, the combination of χώρα with ἐν Λυκίαι is somewhat strange. Instead of χώρα one would expect ὄρος or something similar: cf. sch. *Il.* 6, 181b ἔνιοι δὲ ὄρος εἶναι κατὰ Λυκίαν, ὃ καλεῖται Χίμαιρα. τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ μέσον ἔχειν ἀναφυσήματα πυρός ...; Plin. *Nat.* 5, 100 *In Lycia ... mons Chimaera, noctibus flagrans* and 2, 236; Call. fr. 407 (Pf.) = Antigonus 'Ιστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή 166 Περὶ δὲ πυρὸς Κτησίαν (*FGrHist* 688 F45e) φησὶν ἱστορεῖν, ὅτι περὶ τὴν τῶν Φασηλιτῶν χώραν ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆς Χιμαίρας ὄρους ἔστιν τὸ καλούμενον ἀθάνατον πῦρ· τοῦτο δέ, ἐὰν μὲν εἰς ὕδωρ ἐμβάλῃς, καίεσθαι βέλτιον, ἐὰν δὲ φορυτὸν ἐπιβαλὼν πήξῃ τις, σβέννυσθαι. Secondly, both these and the following texts show that the reading Chimaera fits the context: *Il.* 6, 179-182 ... Χίμαιραν ... ἣ δ' ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων, | πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα, | δεινὸν ἀποπνείουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο; Hes. *Th.* successively enumer-

Since this list only has two items, it cannot be placed securely within a certain tradition. We do not know anything further about the contents or the length, but in view of the heading it is not likely that this list was restricted to the monstrous children of Typhon and Echidna. The link between the two catalogues is not sure, although Daris (*ed. pr.*) suggests that they have a common subject, viz. unnatural phenomena.

66 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4099

The text is written along the fibres in a large, round, heavily decorated hand, probably that of a student. Whereas the papyrus is assigned in the *ed. pr.* to the first century BC or AD, Huys (1996 *ZPE*: 205) rightly states that the date should not be set earlier than the first century AD. Lines 1-12 contain entries written continuously without a clear order. Ca. thirty-two letters are written per line. The following text (l. 13ff.) is written in a smaller column because most lines contained two, two word sentences. The back is blank. There are some itacistic errors and no lectional signs apart from one diaeresis.

Ll. 1-12 consist of an enumeration of names: 1-4 have six instead of seven Epigoni (nom.) plus fathers (gen.). Similar lists with Epigoni are: - Apd. 3, 7, 2 has comparable entries though the order and some names differ; - Hyg. *Fab.* 71 *Septem Epigoni id est filii.* Marshall (1993) prints two lists: the second (A) offers comparable entries (name and father) but the order and one of the names are different. The first list is more extensive—it mentions mothers and homeland and remarks that Aegialus perished—but it shows the same order and names as the papyrus except for one omission in the papyrus and another one in Hyg. A remarkable correspondence between Hyg. and the papyrus

---

ates Hydra and Chimaera as children of Echidna and Typhon: 313ff. *τὸ τρίτον Ὕδρην αὖτις ἐγείνατο λυγρὰ ἰδυῖαν | Λερναίην, ἣν* ... 319 *Ἡ δὲ Χίμαιραν ἔτικτε πνέουϲαν ἀμαιμάκετον πῦρ* ...; Hsch. *s.v.* *Χίμαιρα: τρίμορφον θηρίον, ὃ πρόϲθεν μὲν λέων, μέϲον δὲ χίμαιρα, ὄπιϲθεν δὲ δράκων. φαϲὶν δὲ ἐν Λυκίαι γίνεϲθαι ὡϲ κεφαλὴν μὲν λέοντοϲ ἔμπροϲθεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ϲτόματοϲ πῦρ ἀποπέμπον, ὄπιϲθεν δὲ δράκοντοϲ ἔχον κεφαλήν*; Sch. rec. Pi. *O.* 13, 118-129 (ed. Abel 1891) ... *τὴν Χίμαιραν τὴν πνέουϲαν πῦρ, τουτέϲτιν ἥτιϲ ἔπνει πῦρ* ...; Hyg. also mentions the two monsters together when he lists the children of Typhon and Echidna: *Fab.* 151 ... *hydra quam ad fontem Lernaeum Hercules interfecit* ... *Chimaera in Lycia quae priorem partem leonis figuram, posteriorem draconis habebat, media ipsa Chimaera.* (cf. *praef.* 39); Chimaera occurs alone in *Fab.* 57 ... *Chimaeram* ... *quae tripartito ore flammam spirare dicebatur.*

occurs with the mention of the name Thesimenes/Θηξιμέληc, not attested in other catalogues of Epigoni.

Ll. 4-12 enumerate women introduced by their common denomination, (e.g. Μοῖραι Κλωθὼ Λάχεcιc Ἄτροποc) subsequently: Moirai, Horai, Charites, Nymphs, Sirens, Gorgones, Titanides, Eumenides, Harpies and Hesperides. Though not together, most women occur in a similar list, in Hes. *Th.*, Apd. *Bibl.* and Hyg. *Praef.*

Ll. 13ff. preserve the remains of an introductory formula and two-worded sentences of the Seven Wise Men. Huys (1996 *ZPE*: 205-212) who identified and re-edited this text, enumerates the comparable collections of two-worded sentences in the med. mss., inscriptions and papyri/ostraca. He concludes that our papyrus is an important witness of the text of the ancient model of cod. Vrat. Rhedigeranus gr. 12. He also points to Hyg. *Fab.* 221 which lists name, place of birth and the principal maxim of each of the Seven Wise Men. Although the papyrus list is different from the one in Hyg., the combination of mythical lists and moralistic sentences is the same. Huys suggests that both the *Fab.* and this papyrus may have been used in schools.

67 *P.Yale.* 2, 108

The Yale papyrus contains part of a list with the institutions of five games. Each entry, equivalent to an institution, starts on a new line. The text is written across the fibres on the back of an account in a practised, upright, rather heavy severe hand, assigned to the end of the second or beginning of the third century AD. There are some errors, one of which is corrected by the original scribe who uses an expunging dot. No other lectional signs appear. The lines have some twenty-six letters.

The institutions of the following five games are related: the Isthmian, Olympian, and Nemean games, those held for Patroclus and the Pythian games. They are listed in numerical order. Each institution shows the following information: ordinal - ἀγὼν ἐτέθη ἐν - place, and then in varying order - ἐπὶ man (dative) plus parentage and ὃν ἔθηκεν plus subject. Once, a variant is added: κατ' ἄλλουc λέγεται ... (cf. the parallel in Hyg. below). Line 11 wrongly calls Archemorus the son of Hypsipyle, who is his nurse.

The list is quite similar to the one in fr. 637 (ed. Rose 1967) ascribed to Aristotle's *Peplus*: the institutions are enumerated in the same order and each entry consists of the same elements except for the father. Example: ὄγδοοc ὁ ἐν Νεμέαι, ὃν ἔθηκαν οἱ ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβαc

ἐπὶ Ἀρχεμόρωι· In contrast to the papyrus, the Aristotelian list uses various phrases to indicate the person who instituted the games (e.g. Cιcύφου νομοθετήcαντοc), and it does not have a variant version on the Isthmian games.

Other comparable catalogues are:[38]

- The list in 69, 70-131, is partly more elaborate as it includes enumerations of victors in the games held for Pelias and Patroclus;
- Helladius (ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 279, p. 533b) resembles fr. 637, but the order is different, and it does not mention the persons who institute the games;
- Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 34. He briefly mentions four institutions without a fixed pattern;
- Plin. *Nat.* 7, 205 has a short list with four entries, not the same as in Clem. Al., and it does not mention the founders of the games;
- Hyg. *Fab.* 273 *Qui primi ludos fecerunt usque ad Aeneam quintum decimum* presents the most extensive catalogue with five more institutions than fr. 637, from which the order differs. It includes many remarks on all kinds of topics concerning the games and contestants, and it enumerates the victors in the games held for Pelias and Patroclus. Moreover, the section on the Isthmian games records the same variant as the papyrus: 273.8 *decimo Isthmia Melicertae Athamantis filio et Inus fecisse dicitur Eratocles, alii poetae dicunt Theseum.*

To sum up, the catalogue in this papyrus agrees most with fr. 637 ascribed to the *Peplus* and in a minor degree with Helladius and the separate entries of the *Marmor parium.* Texts which offer more information are Hyg. and 69. We do not know whether the original *Peplus* contained victor-lists as well or whether these are later additions. We must keep in mind that the original could have contained more information than is now present.

68 *P.Oxy.* 10, 1241

This papyrus preserves substantial parts of six consecutive columns of text written in a regular and ornamental uncial, bilinear, round and

[38] Comparable information, though not in the form of catalogues, is found in the following two works: Apd. does not offer a list of games, but the institution of some of them is told: *Bibl.* 2, 7, 2 (Olympian games); 3, 4, 3 (Isthmian games) and 3, 6, 4 (Nemean games with a list of victors); *Epit.* 4, 7 (funeral games held for Patroclus with a list of victors); and cf. *Marmor Parium* A10, 17, 20, 22, 37-38. *P.Harr.* 49 (Pack 2475) preserves names of some Greek cities and festivals, but the contents are not mythical and institutions are not mentioned.

upright, assigned to the first half of the second century AD.[39] Punctuation is effected by a high point, accompanied by marginal paragraphi; a forked paragraphus indicates the close of a section. There are some line-fillers, many diaereses, a rough breathing (l. 162), and some corrections by the first scribe. Diple (cf. ll. 121, 140, 177) and double dots (l. 120) are placed in the margin. Columns consist of thirty-six lines of about twenty letters per line.

This papyrus contains historical and mythical information. The first column shows historical catalogues of famous sculptors, painters and grammarians. These catalogues are preceded by headings which are written immediately after each catalogue.[40] Comparable lists of sculptors and painters occur in Plin. *Nat.* 34, 84; 35, 15,[41] Quint. *Inst.* 12, 10, 3ff. and *P.Berol.* inv. 13044. The latter is a very early compilation (second century BC) containing the type of knowledge that is popular in late antiquity. In addition to the subjects which it has in common with 68 (*ζωγράφοι*, *ἀγαλματοποιοί* and *ἀνδριαντοποιοί*), it offers catalogues of lawgivers, architects, engineers, seven world wonders, islands, mountains, rivers, springs and lakes.[42]

The second column begins with a historical list of Alexandrian librarians, which is directly, that is, without a heading or blank space, followed by a catalogue of inventions concerning warfare and weapons (l. 30ff.). Only the military catalogue is discussed because it consists chiefly of mythical material in contrast to the other sections.

---

[39] The text is written by the same person as *PSI* 11, 1211 (Aeschylus, *Myrmidons*); for this 'scribe 10', see Turner (1956: 144-146). For more recent lists of scribes from Oxyrhynchus, see Krüger (1990: 193-195) and Johnson (1992: 149-152).

[40] The line-beginnings (now lost) have probably contained paragraphi as seen in the other columns.

[41] According to Pliny's *praef.* §33, his work is meant to be a reference book: he made a table of contents so that the reader could find matters without having to read the whole work. Quintilian's work is also a kind of reference book with a strong didactic purpose, cf. *prooemium* 6.

[42] I do not discuss this papyrus (Pack 2068; II BC) separately because it does not contain mythical lists. It is included in the collection of Greek and Latin texts and catalogues on the seven world wonders in Brodersen (1992: see esp. 56, 59 and 74). Many geographical catalogues made by different authors can be found in Riese (1878) and cf. Regenbogen (1950: 1466ff.). Cf. also Hyg. *Fab.* 223 *Septem opera mirabilia*, 276 *Insulae maximae* and Ampelius *Liber Memorialis*, which contains catalogues of the most famous mountains, rivers and islands (6, 6ff.) and of the seven world wonders (8, 18ff.). Both the prologue of this book (cf. p. 153) and *P.Berol.* inv. 13044 suggest that the historical and geographical lists were used in an educational context. The same can be deduced from the papyri and literature mentioned in n. 4.

The information is presented almost completely in acc. cum inf. and nom. cum inf. depending on words like φαcι(ν), λέγουcι(ν), ἱcτοροῦcι(ν) and λέγεται. Three times a certain author has been mentioned: Hellanicus (l. 119), Philochorus (l. 122) and perhaps Aristotle (l. 46 Αρι̣[). We further see vague references like *οἱ μὲν* ... *τινὲc δέ/ἄλλοι δέ/ἕτεροι δέ*, with or without words of saying, which show that alternative versions are recorded. There is no fixed pattern of data though the entries usually start with the invention, then the inventor(s) and the variants if present.

The first part of the catalogue might go back to an alphabetically arranged work: irrespective of the alternative names, we see four names with *alpha*, then Heracles, Theseus, Aetolus (the exception, with an alternative name: Ixion) and Ismenus. In addition to this, the presence of sources and alternative versions points to a scholarly tradition. According to the editors "it is a characteristic product of the Alexandrian erudition which exercised itself in antiquarian research and tabulation." This conclusion is confirmed by the presence of critical signs in the margin, which indicates a scholarly usage.[43] And we may compare the similar lists in Pliny, whose work was a kind of reference book (cf. n. 41), cf. Plin. *Nat.* 7, 200-202: an enumeration of weapons and other matters regarding war with their inventors, e.g. ... *iaculum cum ammento Aetolum Martis filium, hastas uelitares Tyrrenum* ... depending on *inuenisse dicunt*. Authors are not mentioned, a variant version is given twice. See also Athenaeus *περὶ μηχανημάτων*, esp. 10, 5; 27, 2 and 29, 9; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 16, 74ff. mentions some inventions concerned with war. In this section on inventions, variant versions are recorded and sources are sometimes mentioned by name; Hyg. *Fab.* 274 mentions among other inventions some concerned with war, cf. sections 8 and 22.

69 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4306

P.Oxy. 4306 consists of 27 fragments which show the remains of some eight lists. The papyrus is written along the fibres in a rounded upright capital of medium size, rather informal and generally bilinear, assigned to the first or second century AD. Punctuation is sometimes indicated by a blank space. A coronis in the left-hand margin, first accompanied by a forked paragraphus and one letter written in ekthesis,

---

[43] Cf. Turner (1956: 144-145) on the characteristics of a scholar's text.

indicates the end of a catalogue (cf. 45ff., 63ff., 187ff. col. II). Small paragraphi indicate transitions between the entries in the seventh list (cf. 73 and 78). There are some line-fillers, and letters are written above the line at the end of lines to preserve a regular column-width. The column-height was at least thirty-two lines of ca. twenty-one letters and the present upper and lower margin are resp. 4 and 5.1 cm. There are several corrections, most of them written above the line preceded by an expunging dot (cf. 8, 14, 22, 35, 49) or little line (26). The corrections in lines 22 and 35 seem to have been written in a lighter ink.

The catalogues do not present a particular common subject or principle of arrangement. The lists are introduced by a heading which follows the preceding list after a small blank space. The first list (ll. 1-19) is about people who were the first to sacrifice to certain gods. The pattern of data is god (dative), people who sacrifice and place where it occurred. When the people who sacrifice are individuals, there may be an entry on the parents or their name. In the case of cities, islands or nations who sacrifice, the place name is omitted when it would have been the same (cf. ll. 12-14). The pattern is once interrupted (ll. 17-19) for an alternative version starting with *ἔνιοι δέ φαϲιν*.

Some comparable information on first sacrifices occurs in Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 44 preceded by other remarks on sacrifices to gods and heroes (cf. 2, 29.4 and 2, 38.2ff.). Clement provides this information in order to make a contrast between it and the Christian faith.[44]

The heading *οἵδε - ἵδρυϲαν* announces the subject of the second list (ll. 19-32): the first builders of temples. We see three temples of Zeus followed by two of Hera. In addition to the basic elements of this list—god (gen.), builder, town and area—we find a remark on a cult-title of Zeus (l. 24). A closely related list occurs in Hyg. *Fab.* 225 *Qui primi*[45] *templa deorum constituerunt*; it shows no fixed scheme, but usually gives the following information: person who built the temple,[46] god (plus epithet), place. E.g. *Aedem Ioui Olympio primum fecit Pelasgus Triopae filius in Arcadia.*

---

[44] See also Ps.-Clem. *Recogn.* 10, 24-25 on honours bestowed on children of gods and heroes.

[45] Marshall (1993) prints *prima* in the heading and *primi* in the index (p. 7).

[46] Instead of *templum*, we once see *aedem* and *simulacrum*. The mother or father of the builder is sometimes mentioned as well.

What remains of the third catalogue (ll. 33-47) shows that we are not concerned with a bare list of epithets of gods, but with a rather learned explanation of the epithets. There is only one explanation for each epithet. The information is presented as follows: first, an event is told in which a particular person, place and goddess are involved; this serves to explain the origin of the epithet. Then, a poet is mentioned plus a quotation of a verse in which the epithet occurs. In the first case, the explanation seems to be based on a place-name in contrast to the habit of Apollodorus of Athens (cf. below). The quotations which are attributed to Hesiod and Homer, are strange combinations of epic formulas (see comm. *ed. pr.*).

Since there are no parallels for the explanations found, it is difficult to establish the place of this piece in the literary tradition. The explanation of epithets or names in general appear already in the oldest poetry. Homer and especially Hesiod contain many etymological explanations.[47] After their works, many other authors, especially philosophers and grammarians, dealt in one way or another with this subject. The grammarian Apollodorus of Athens also paid much attention to etymologies.[48] In contrast to the practice shown in this papyrus, Apollodorus offers many explanations instead of only one, and he explicitly rejects explanations based on names of places or mythical persons (cf. *FGrHist* 244 F 353). He further uses many citations in his arguments, even to illustrate explanations of epithets which he rejects. In view of its obscure explanations and quotations, this section might have been extracted from some learned work.[49]

Directly after the section on epithets follows the heading *οἴδε - φύϲιν* and a list of four women who were metamorphosized (ll. 47-58).

---

[47] Cf. Risch (1947: 72-91). To mention some of his examples: cf. *Il.* 6, 402; Hes. *Th.* 144-145, 281-283, 188-200. For a discussion of etymology in general, see Reitzenstein (1907: 807-817) and Pfeiffer (1968: 4, 12, 61-62, 241) with many references to relevant literature.

[48] For his work, cf. *FGrHist* 244 F 88-153 *Περὶ θεῶν*, plus Anhang F 352-356 and F 222-225 *Ἐτυμολογουμένων*; *P.Oxy.* 20, 2260; see also Pfeiffer (1968: 260ff.) and Henrichs (1975: 5-38, esp. 20ff.).

[49] A papyrus in Berlin deals with the same subject: *TAGP* II, cf. Wilcken (1891: IX + Taf. II) = Pack 2470. There is no published edition of this papyrus, Wilcken only describes the contents and gives a transcription of Col. I lines 5 and 17. This papyrus lists epithets of gods, followed by explanations. Gods dealt with are: Apollo, Zeus, Poseidon, Hera and Athena. Each new epithet is written in ekthesis. Some explanations are rather elementary, while others include explanatory stories and even a quotation (*Il.* 15, 309-310). G. Poethke informed me that this papyrus will sometime be published in *APF*.

In view of *οἵδε* l. 47, the list is likely to have incorporated men as well. In addition to the basic elements—woman (acc.), father, animal (acc.), *γενέcθαι*[50]—we see some short remarks, the first apparently on the constellation ̓Αρκτος, and the second on the Bosporus. This list closely resembles the one in Ps.-Clem. *Recogn.* 10, 26, 3. The other catalogues of metamorphoses (cf. the enumeration in 70) present their data differently and most times of more length.

The subject of the fifth list (ll. 59-64) is difficult to identify because of the limited remains, but it seems to be part of a list of sons of gods and mortal women: Pan, son of Hermes and Penelope, and Trophonius, son of Apollo and Iocaste.[51] The remains of this list are too scanty to draw inferences about its place in the tradition, but cf. 64 for literature on the offspring of gods and mortals.

There is hardly anything left of the sixth list (ll. 64-69): only part of a heading and some other words that point to inventors, either in general or of religious matters only.

Fragments 3-9 (ll. 70-131) constitute the seventh catalogue which deals with the institutions of games. The following information is recorded: the number of each game, the founder, the place of foundation, the reason why and/or the person(s) for whom the games were held the first time. In addition to these elements, we find enumerations of victors in the games held for Pelias and Patroclus. The enumerations present victor, father and contest. The order of institutions probably agrees with Arist. fr. 637 (cf. *ed. pr.* 46) and 67, where comparable catalogues are discussed. The information is also presented in the same way, but is at times more extensive; cf. the genealogy of Acastus (ll. 87-89)[52] and the lists of victors (ll. 91-103; 107-114). In this respect, the list is most similar to Hyg. *Fab.* 273, which is, however, even more extensive because it incorporates many remarks on all kinds of topics concerning the games and contestants.

---

[50] The acc. cum inf. depends on *μυθεῖται* (twice).

[51] Harder (*ed. pr.* 45) points out that another possible subject of this list might be people who became immortal though Trophonius would not fit such a context. However, both Pan and Trophonius were honoured in sanctuaries. According to Harder, l. 62 . . ̣ εọυc and l. 64 *γινουc* may be references to the regular husbands or alternative fathers. If this list had contained such references, one would have expected them to follow directly after Hermes and Apollo. These remains might be references to an alternative father of Penelope and to the father of Iocaste, or to place-names or to alternative mothers. Sometimes the genealogical information is rather elaborate, cf. ll. 87-89.

[52] Instead of]c Εὐάδνη[c *ed. pr.*, the traces (cf. text) favour the reading *καὶ* Πο]cειδῶνọ[c; for this genealogy, cf. e.g. Apd. 1, 9, 18 and Hyg. *Fab.* 157.

As to the games for Patroclus (ll. 106-114), the names of the victors and contests agree to a great extent with *Il.* 23, 257ff., but they are listed in a different order, and in contrast to the *Il.*, this list mentions the paternity of Odysseus. There are three similar prose catalogues, of which only the first offers a complete list:
- Ps.-Dositheus (in Rose 1933: 181): an enumeration of games and victors, whose fathers are usually not mentioned. There are several errors in the names of the victors and contests, and some additional information is given;
- Apd. *Epit.* 4, 7 mentions only the first three games with victors;
- Hyg. *Fab.* 273. 13 has only two names of victors, games and prizes, which are not mentioned in the other prose lists. The information differs completely from the *Il.*

In the games held for Pelias (ll. 85-103), the enumeration is once interrupted for a short remark on an accident. This whole section from l. 91 onwards is almost identical with **63**, an independent list of victors in the games held for Pelias, which does not form part of a larger catalogue of institutions. See **63** for comparable literature.

The eighth list (ll. 132-152) enumerates murderers tried in the Areopagus. The remains of this section are too scanty to be described or compared with the other catalogues:
- sch. E. *Or.* 1648 and 1651;
- Hyg. *Fab.* 272 *Iudicia parricidarum qui in Areopago causam dixerunt* is now lost, but it preceded the institution of the games;
- *Marmor Parium* A3 and 25;
- cf. *P.Giss.Univ.* 4, 42 (Pack 2458); fr. B of this papyrus seems to deal with the Areopagus, but it cannot be deduced from the meager remains whether this text is part of a catalogue or not.

The contents of the other fragments are not identified except for fr. 12 (ll. 153-169) which seems to stem from a text about oracles. To sum up, most catalogues preserved in this papyrus (1, 2, 6-8) are concerned with heurematographical matters as defined on p. 120. The subjects often occur in Hyg. *Fab.* and in writings of Clem. Al. or Ps.-Clem. as well. It is reasonable to conclude that many of these catalogues go back to works on *heuremata*, of which the *Peplus* might have been one.[53]

---

[53] In view of fr. 637 (ascribed to Aristotle's *Peplus*, cf. ed. Rose 1967) which agrees with Hyg. *Fab.* 273, and in view of fr. 638 on the invention of the alphabet, which subject is differently told in Hyg. *Fab.* 277, Wendling (1891: 27ff.) concludes that the *Peplus* probably contained more εὑρήματα such as found in

70 *P.Mich.* inv. 1447

This papyrus preserves parts of two columns written in a practised, informal capital with a number of cursive and irregular features, assigned to the late second or early third century AD. On the recto is a register of names and amounts of money. There are some errors and corrections, diaereses, one breathing (l. 41) and a low stop (l. 28). Iota adscript is written. The entries are clearly separated from each other by a blank line and a forked paragraphus. Lines are ca. thirty-six letters long. Renner (*ed. pr.* 279) suggests that the text was written or copied for the use of a private individual in view of the specialized nature of the work, the use of the verso of a documentary roll and the somewhat sloppy format of the text.

The second column contains five stories about metamorphoses of mythical persons, whose names all begin with *alpha*: Actaeon, Arethusa, Aethyiae, Alcyone, and Ascalaphus. The stories preserve the following elements in this order: main person, parentage, reason for the metamorphosis, the god who made it happen, and the source for the story. The text of the first column is not identified though l. 21-22 may deal with Aglauros, daughter of Cecrops.

The finite verbs are indicatives of past tense. Only κα[λ]εῖ (l. 39) seems to deviate, but this might be due to a writing error. The clauses which refer to the sources of these stories comprise present indicatives. Most of the stories consist of only one or two sentences, so conjunctions are rare. Apart from the ordinate clauses with ὡϲ, there is one relative clause. We see further five circumstantial participles (nom.) and one gen. abs., several pronouns, two adjectives, but no adverbs or negations.

This papyrus makes a learned impression: not only does it stem from an alphabetically arranged collection, but the information is presented in a fixed scheme and a source—three times Hesiod—is mentioned for each story. According to the editor (279):

---

the works of Plin., Clem. Al. and Hyg. mentioned on p. 120. A more careful opinion is expressed by Regenbogen (1950: 1471) who argues against Wendling that the ascription of the *Peplus* to Aristotle and its precise connection with peripatetic literature on εὑρήματα remains uncertain: "Ich würde den sog. Peplos, der auf den Namen des Aristoteles gestellt wurde, für ein Stück jener Literatur der Varia oder Symmikta halten, die seit hellenistischer Zeit und namentlich im späteren Altertum einen grossen Umfang angenommen hat." See also Kremmer (1890) who traces the inventions found in Clem. Al. *Strom.* back to Scamon, Theophrastus, Straton and Philostephanus.

> it is quite likely that the dictionary is a copy, perhaps condensed or excerpted, of an already existing compilation. There is no reason why this, or the core of it, could not go back to Hellenistic times. In particular, the obscure stories of the Chalcidian Arethusa and the Aethyiae suggest the Alexandrians' fondness for recondite local legends.

Metamorphoses are a popular theme in antiquity.[54] Therefore I only mention extant comparable prose catalogues or collections:
- a collection of prose stories composed by Antoninus Liberalis. A comparison between the metamorphoses of Ant. Lib. and the papyrus shows that they have two subjects in common (Alcyone, cf. Ant. Lib. 11—these two versions agree only on the theme of reckless love—and Ascalaphus, cf. Ant. Lib. 24), yet their narratives are different. Besides, the papyrus shows an alphabetical arrangement, the stories are shorter and sources are mentioned;
- a list of seven metamorphoses of an anonymous author, in Westermann (1843: 347). Each entry usually consists of one long sentence which mentions the person, event and god involved in the metamorphosis. E.g. *Νυκτιμένη Κλυμένου θυγάτηρ φεύγουcα τὸν τοῦ πατρὸc ἔρωτα κατ' ἔλεον Ἀθηνᾶc εἰc γλαῦκα μετεμορφώθη*;
- Ps.-Clem. *Recogn.* 10, 26, 3; *Hom.* 5, 17, 1-4; the latter contains only transformations into constellations, cf. Ps.-Eratosthenes *Cat.*

The stories in the papyrus are most similar to the metamorphoses in Westermann, although the latter do not mention sources.

71 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4098

This small fragment is written along the fibres in a medium to large, careful capital script, assigned to the third century AD. The verso contains an unidentified piece of prose, perhaps some kind of *Περcικά*, written in an informal severe style datable to the third century AD. There are no lectional signs. The lines contain ca. twenty letters.

The text consists of the beginning of a list of people killed by Heracles probably preceded by an introduction or heading (ll. 1-3), in which *πελαcγείαc* may refer to some part of Greece where Heracles travelled.[55] The entries consist of Heracles' victims, in the acc., plus a short remark on family. The second entry also describes the nature

---

[54] For metamorphoses, see Lafaye (1904: esp. 1-45); Papathomopoulos (1968: introd.); Forbes Irving (1990).

[55] It seems far-fetched to connect *πελαcγείαc* with the quotation of E. *HF* 464, as is done in the *ed. pr.*

of the Molionids. The second and third entry are written in ekthesis in contrast to the first, where the alpha of Ἀμύντορα is written at the end of l. 3.[56] The alphabetic order of these three entries may be accidental.

A similar list does not seem to exist though several works mention people killed by Heracles, cf. e.g. Hyg. *Fab.* 31 on Heracles' *parerga*, Apd. *Bibl.* 2, 5, 9; 2, 7, 2ff.; D.S. 4, 33, 5-6; Paus. 3, 14, 6ff. Lists with comparable themes are Hyg. *Fab.* 265 *Qui a Neptuno perierunt, uel a Mercurio, uel a Minerua*; 266 *Qui ab Apolline perierunt* (both lost).

72 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4307

The text is written along the fibres in a medium-sized upright capital, generally bilinear (only η rising high) and often adorned with small serifs. It is assigned to the second century AD. High stops are used to separate entries. No further lectional signs or iota adscripts appear. There is one itacistic writing. The lines carry ca. nineteen letters.

This fragment contains part of a list of mothers who killed their children. The entries, which are written continuously apart from the stops, show the following elements: mother, her father (gen.), child, child's father, reason (ὀργῇ or λυπῇ). There exists one similar catalogue: Hyg. *Fab.* 239 *Matres quae filios interfecerunt*, with the same four entries at the beginning. Only Medea and Procne occur in reversed order. Hyg. does not always mention the reason for the killing but provides sometimes more genealogical information. This list has apparently no connections with learned works. The same holds for more catalogues in Hyg., cf. e.g. 246 *Qui filios suos in epulis consumpserunt*; 247 *Qui a canibus consumpti sunt*; 248 *Qui ab apro percussi interierunt*; 252 *Qui lacte ferino nutriti sunt.*

73 *P.Corn.* 55

This papyrus consists of one column of text and the beginning of another one (unidentified) written across the fibres on the back of a fragmentary account in rather large, irregular uncials assigned to the beginning of the first century AD. There are no lectional signs, but perhaps one abbreviation (l. 11). The longest line counts eighteen let-

---

56 The reason for this layout is obscure: were the preceding lines perhaps written in ekthesis so that the first entry would not attract attention if set out in ekthesis?

ters. Each entry and the alternative version in l. 8 is written on a new line; the other lines are slightly indented.

This list enumerates five mythical men and their fathers or both parents (gen.), who are connected with the cult of gods, most of them with Demeter.[57] In the case of Triptolemus, three variants regarding the parents are recorded probably preceded by [*οἱ μέν*] ... [*οἱ δέ*] ... *οἱ δέ* ... Salvadori Baldascino (1990: 207) assumes that the men are "sacerdoti e conservatori dei sacri archivi" in view of ll. 14-15 which she supplements with *ἱερομ*]*νημ*[*ό*]*νων* | [*οἱ ἄρι*]*cτοι*. This would be a kind of end-title, which is not likely or at least remarkable since other catalogues show headings but no end-titles. However, she also mentions the possibility of a heading of a second subject (209): "Tuttavia non si può escludere la possibilità di leggere qui il titolo della nuova rubrica." According to Salvadori Baldascino, the text might be a compendium made for school use, although the hand is not that of a beginner. No comparable catalogue seems to exist.

74 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 26727

The text is written along the fibres in an upright hand with serifs assigned to the second century AD. The back of this light-brown papyrus, of good quality, is blank. Diaereses occur and a second hand has made a note in the lower margin. Small blank spaces separate some words. The text seems to consist of six separate sections in view of both the contents and several lines that are only partially covered with text. It is not clear whether these sections are entries of one or more catalogues or rather short extracts and notes. Cf. the *ed. pr.* for more information on the obscure mythical names.

According to Tanja Idgenhorst, lines 1-4 deal with Halirrothius who was killed by Ares because he attempted to violate Ares' daughter Alcippe (cf. Apd. *Bibl.* 3, 14, 2).[58] Lines 5-8 mention Dorus' five daughters who brought forth Nymphs, Curetes and Satyrs. Lines 9-12, of which l. 9 is a heading, are concerned with names of women: it is argued in the *ed. pr.* that these women are probably daughters of Asclepius, but there are many other possibilities which are mentioned

---

[57] Cf. Henrichs (1987: 250-251) and Salvadori Baldascino (1990: 205-210) who re-edited the papyrus.

[58] More supplements, alternative readings, and a commentary will probably be published in an article in *ZPE* by T. Idgenhorst who wrote a paper on this papyrus when she studied at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (spring 1997).

in the commentary as well. Lines 13-15 relate the names of the daughters of Leucippus in connection with Castor and Pollux. The name Amphithea is elsewhere not connected with the Leucippides. Lines 16-18 (cf. the text in Part Two) may have once contained a transition between the Leucippides and the following children of Thestius, which are recorded in lines 19-23. Lines 24-25 consist of a heading and the beginning of an entry on the Oenotropoi.

The editors suspect that this papyrus is concerned with the hunt of the Calydonian boar, which would provide a link between the majority of the persons mentioned. Although I cannot offer another link, the idea of the Calydonian hunt seems unlikely given that the greater part of the text deals with women who are not relevant to the Calydonian hunt (cf. **61** for relevant literature). Whatever the precise subject may be, the text is not a list with only names or a fixed pattern of data. Instead of a catalogue, it could also be a kind of commentary which pays much attention to names, genealogy and women.

* *P.Oxy.* 65, 4460

The text of this Oxyrhynchus papyrus will be published in *P.Oxy.* 65. The two fragments contain a list of eight gods with their parents and a list of at least seven Homeric heroes with their parents. It may be a school text.

3 Comparative survey of papyri

3.1 Provenance, date, hand, lectional signs, layout

The provenance of nine of the papyri reviewed above is certain: **58**, **60**, **61**, **66**, **68**, **69**, **71** and **72** are from Oxyrhynchus and **64** is found in Tebtunis; **59** might stem from the Fayum and the other papyri are of unknown origin. The papyri range in date between the first and third century AD.

Five of our texts have been written on the back of documentary texts (**60**, **65**, **67**, **70** and **73**), **71** has a literary text on its back, **62** is written on the back of a papyrus of which the front is blank, and the back of the other papyri seems to be blank. The hands of papyri **58**, **66** and **73** are somewhat irregular. The other hands range between practised informal and beautifully executed hands of several types. Most of them are probably written by professional scribes. One papy-

rus whose scribe is 'known' (cf. comm. 68) is obviously a scholar's copy as is shown not only by the learned contents but also by the presence of critical signs in the margin. As for lectional signs, some diaereses, apostrophes and/or stops occur in 60, 61, 66, 68, 70, 72 and 74; 68 and 70 also have one breathing; line-fillers occur in 65, 68 and 69. The latter is the only papyrus in which examples of a coronis are preserved. Paragraphi are found in 59, 60, 64, 68-70. Almost all the papyri show itacisms or other small errors though some of them have been corrected. 64 and perhaps 73 employ some abbreviations.

Most catalogues do not contain many letters per line and appear to be written in rather narrow columns compared with the other papyri under examination: nine texts (59, 62, 63, 65, 68, 69, 71-73) vary between about fifteen and twenty-one letters per line; three (60, 64, 67) have ca. twenty-four to twenty-six and four (58, 66, 70, 74) ca. thirty to forty letters per line. The high number of letters per line in three of these four papyri is due to their aberrant contents: the catalogue in 58 is directly based on a poem, which does not seem to be the case in the other papyri; the hand also suggests that this catalogue has been written by some individual, certainly not a professional scribe, for private usage. The entries of 70 are actually short stories quite different from the other catalogues, which may explain the broad column width. The precise nature of 74 is uncertain, see commentary.

The low amount of letters per line is quite remarkable since most entries consist of several names or phrases which count more letters than the actual line. Compare for instance, 63, 9ff. where each entry consisting of three words (e.g. Πολυδεύκηϲ Τυνδάρεω πυγμήν = twenty-four letters) could easily have been written on one line. Instead of this, the scribe prefers to write the entries continuously, separated only by small blank spaces, in a narrow column. When we express the column width in centimeters, the following picture emerges: 59, 63, 65, 68 and 69 have a column width of ca. 5.5-6 cm; 71, 72, 73 ca. 6.5-7 cm, and 60, 62, 64 ca. 8-8.5 cm; 58 (perhaps 61), 66, 70 have 10 cm or more. The width of 67 is unknown; 74 was at least 6.5 cm and perhaps as broad as 9 cm.

The way in which the contents are presented differs widely, but transitions between successive catalogues are usually marked. Some papyri show headings written on new lines (cf. 65, indented, and perhaps 62 and 74), 69 has headings in the lines where the preceding list ends accompanied by coronis, and/or paragraphus, and blank space; 60 has one transition marked by a paragraphus and one only preceded by a blank space. The transitions in 63 and 68 are not marked

but their line-beginnings, in which paragraphi may have been written, are lost.

The same variety is visible in the layout of the entries within one catalogue: all entries in **70** are separated by one blank line and a long forked paragraphus; entries often start at the beginning of lines, cf. **58**, **61**, **65** (only second list), **67**, **71** (with ekthesis) and **73**. Within this group, **61** is unique since it presents the elements of one entry in separate columns (cf. comm. and text). In the other papyri, entries are not separated from each other (**59**,[59] **62**, **65** (first list), **66**, **69** (most lists), **74**) or only by high stops (**60** and **72**), paragraphi (**64** and **69** - seventh list), stops and paragraphi (**68**) or blank spaces (**63**).

The presentation of the information seems to be due completely to the scribe: the catalogue of games in **67** and the seventh list of **69**, and the catalogue of Argonauts in **60** and **61** are comparable but their form is clearly different. There is no obvious connection between the presentation of the contents and the use of recto or verso. The texts that are most easily consulted in view of their layout are written both on the backs of documents and on papyrus not used before, cf. e.g. **67** and **70** with **61**.

3.2 Contents

Six papyri (**58**, **64**, **67**, **70-72**) offer only part of one catalogue, though originally they might have contained more. As for **73** and **74**, it is not clear whether the contents form part of one or more catalogues and **59** has a story and one catalogue. The remaining eight papyri (**60-63**, **65**, **66**, **68** and **69**) contain more than one catalogue, but none of them has an obvious principle of arrangement or choice of subject. Especially **69** shows a jumble of catalogues: first sacrifices together with metamorphoses, explanations of obscure epithets and more. **66** is also remarkable for the combination of catalogues and sentences of the Seven Wise Men.

When we examine the order of entries within one catalogue, we find a numerical order in **67** and the seventh list in **69**, an alphabetical order in **61**, **64** and **70** (and perhaps **71**, cf. comm.), and an order of entries based on a poem, cf. **58**. The arrangement of entries in **60** (Greek leaders and Argonauts) is probably adopted from the same

[59] The entries in **59** are not marked, though the paragraphi at the top and bottom presumably mark larger sections.

work in which the information on parentage was found. The order of entries in the remaining papyri is perhaps based on preceding works as well but they are not known to us.

Some catalogues consist of enumerations of single names (cf. **65** dogs and **66**, the names of women), but most of their entries show several elements, such as the names of an Argonaut, his father and homeland. These elements are usually arranged in a more or less fixed pattern, which may be once or twice interrupted by the inclusion of other information. Examples of fixed patterns without interruptions are **60**, the lists of Greek leaders and Argonauts, and **72**; the repetitive pattern of victor-father-contest in **63** and **69** is interrupted for a short remark on an accident; see also **64**. Entries with a restricted number of elements are usually more fixed than entries that consist of many elements. Exceptional is the list of Greek leaders in **59**, in which the three elements of the entries vary in order.

Most catalogues are bare lists with only a few vague references to alternative versions, sources or the tradition in general, cf. **65** *μυθολογεῖται*, **67** *κατ' ἄλλουϲ λέγεται*, **73** *οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δέ*. In contrast to these, we find precise indications of sources in **68**, a papyrus which includes alternative versions, and **70**, and quotations in the section on epithets in **69**. Other remarkable things are the personal address in **60**, and the poetic words in **59**. The latter might point to a rather close connection between the papyrus text and the original work, probably closer than usual since most catalogues apart from **58** were likely not based upon the original sources.

4 Comparison with Ps.-Hyginus' Fabulae

Since the papyri with catalogues are most similar to the second half of Hyg. *Fab.*, that part will be briefly discussed.[60] The *Fab.* may also shed some light on the question of why such mythical lists were composed.

Like the catalogues in the papyri, those in Hyg. show many differences in arrangement and contents. Some catalogues consist only of names, cf. 11, 163 or 170.1-8. The latter enumerates asyndetically the daughters of Danaus and the sons of Aegyptus, who are killed, e.g.

[60] For a general introduction and comparison with the narrative *hypp.*, see p. 28ff. and for a comparison with Homeric *hypp.* p. 72. App. One 2 contains more observations on contents, syntax and vocabulary.

Midea Antimachum. Philomela Panthium etc. This catalogue concludes with a story about the only surviving Aegyptid, Lynceus. Like the order of entries in most catalogues, the order in which the couples occur seems to be arbitrary. However, rare instances of alphabetic arrangement are found: cf. the beginning of the list in 81, the second enumeration of dogs in 181[61] and the end of 182. In addition to these catalogues with names, we find catalogues that enumerate persons or events or other subjects about whom/which some or much information is added, cf. e.g. 14 *Argonautae conuocati*: some entries are short, e.g. *Menoetius Actoris filius, Opuntius*, others longer, e.g. *Mopsus Ampyci et Chloridis filius; hic augurio doctus ab Apolline ex Oechalia uel ut quidam putant Titarensis*; and cf. the digression on Caeneus (14.4). When Hyg. and the papyri have comparable lists, those in Hyg. are often more extensive for they include more information on parentage and other matters. In addition to the lists that are concerned with mythical subjects, some lists occur that contain historical and geographical information: 221 *Septem sapientes*, 222 *Septem lyrici* (lost), 223 *Septem opera mirabilia*, 276 *Insulae maximae*.

As far as the position of the catalogues is concerned, some lists occur among the stories, but the majority are put together from 221 onwards. In contrast to the papyri where there is no comparable organization, many lists are grouped by subject matter: 226-233, for example, deal with relationships between gods and humans, and 234-248 are all concerned with death. Yet some lists do not show any link, as the subjects of the following four illustrate: 251 *Qui ab inferis redierunt*, 252 *Qui lacte ferino nutriti sunt*, 253 *Quae contra fas concubuerunt*, 254 *Quae piae fuerunt, uel qui pii.*

It seems likely that one part of the catalogues has been compiled from the preceding *fabulae* (e.g. 243 and 246),[62] while the other part goes back to earlier literature. The catalogues in Homer (e.g. catalogue of ships, cf. 97), Hesiod,[63] and other poetry (e.g. 14, list of Argonauts) were continuously (re)copied, imitated and altered by later writers. Apart from the catalogues found in poetry, many lists origi-

---

[61] Cf. Grilli (1971: 354ff.) who demonstrates that this list is based on a Greek list ordered alphabetically.

[62] Cf. Wendling (1891: 70-81).

[63] *Fab.* 81 *Proci Helenae*—cf. fr. 196-204 in Merkelbach-West (1990)—, 155-162 with lists of the sons of several gods, and 226-232 on the liaisons of gods with mortals (now lost), were inspired by Hesiod's catalogues, cf. Schwartz (1960: 285ff.).

nated from the scholarly activities of, for example, the Peripatetics and Alexandrians.[64] The origins, functions and aims of the original catalogues must have differed widely. As far as Hyg. is concerned, his work still contains much valuable information, but in an abridged form paying almost no attention to sources.

There is no preface that sheds light on the purpose and function of the *Fab.*, but we know that a selection from this book was made by Ps.-Dositheus in 207 AD for educational purposes.[65] The historical and geographical lists, which it seems likely were added to the mythical body of knowledge later (cf. Breen 1991: 72), point in the same direction. The educational function of such lists can be deduced from the prologue of the *Liber Memorialis* of Ampelius in which comparable catalogues (cf. p. 138 n. 42) form part of an encyclopedic corpus of knowledge probably destined to educate the young M. Opellius Macrinus (an emperor in the second century AD): *Lucius Ampelius Macrino suo salutem. Uolenti tibi omnia nosse scripsi hunc librum memorialem, ut noris quid sit mundus, quid elementa, quid orbis terrarum ferat, uel quid genus humanum peregerit.* It is thus likely that the *Fab.* functioned in an educational context as well, but the present order of the stories and the mass of catalogues do not stimulate reading from beginning to end. The *Fab.* seems to be a kind of encyclopedic reference book[66] possibly used not only by teachers and students, but

---

[64] Wendling (1891: esp. 70ff.) argues that *Fab.* 225, 273-275 and 277 (about founders of sanctuaries and cities, about the institution of games, and about discoveries) are ultimately derived from a work on εὑρήματα which formed part of Aristotle's *Peplus*, but cf. the remarks in n. 53. For heuremata, see also Kremmer (1890).

[65] Cf. the first part of Ps.-Dositheus' bilingual preface written to introduce his collection of stories based on Hyg. (only the Latin text is printed because it is clearer than the Greek translation): *Maximo et Apro consulibus tertio Id. Septembres Ygini genealogiam omnibus notam descripsi, in qua erunt plures istoriae interpretatae in hoc libro. deorum enim et dearum nomina in secundo explicuimus; sed in hoc erunt eorum enarrationes, licet non omnes, eorum tamen quorum interim possum.* It appears that Ps.-Dositheus in the third book of his *Hermeneumata* (for this school book, cf. p. 69) wrote down a selection of stories from the genealogy of Hyg. in 207 AD, that is, when Maximus and Aprus were consuls. The purpose of the *Hermeneumata* is to teach the readers Latin or Greek; cf. Jahn-Michaelis (1873: 86-90), Götz (1892 ed. *CGL* 3: 56ff.), and the description in *RE* (1905: 1606-1607).

[66] The presence of an index would have facilitated searching, but whether the actual index accompanied Hyg. *Fab.* from the beginning is unknown.

also by the same kind of people that read or consulted the collections of Parthenius (cf. p. XV) and Apd. (cf. p. 167ff.).

5 Conclusions

As in the preceding chapters, this final section is concerned with the following questions: what kind of information is transmitted and how is this done? How are the contents of the papyri related to other literature? What can we conclude about the function and readership?

The papyri with catalogues transmit knowledge in a condensed form. The catalogues of the first type that go back to epic or lyric catalogues are stripped of their poetical wording and context. Many are mixed with or expanded by other information and again systematized and abbreviated. The second type, namely catalogues that are rooted in a learned tradition, do not preserve much of the original studies, in which scholars mentioned their sources by name, sometimes noted the names of the books, and included quotations and their own comments and conclusions.[67] Over time such writings were contracted so that in the end only catalogues remained. The reader is no longer presented with precise sources and specific details, but with a digested collection of information.[68] Some papyrus texts form part of large compilations, others contain only part of one catalogue which may have once occurred among other lists or in compendia (cf. the survey on p. 150). The papyri not only show a wide diversity of subjects, but also many differences in the presentation of the catalogues, and in the length and arrangement (e.g. alphabetical, numerical) of the entries.

Let us now consider the link between the papyrus texts and other ancient literature. Catalogues always formed an important constituent of ancient literature from Homer and Hesiod onwards. Both poets and prose writers made use of the principle of listing to organize knowledge about the universe, the gods, the people, and their history.

[67] Cf. Wendel (1935 *RE*: 1355-1358) on the mythographical works of the Alexandrians, and Pfeiffer (1968) on Aristotelian and Hellenistic scholarship with references to important editions and secondary literature.

[68] The activity of compiling, summarizing and excerpting previous literature becomes a common phenomenon during the Empire, cf. Wendel (1935 *RE*: 1365ff.); Lesky (1957/58: 772ff.); Erbse (1961: 234ff.); Tomberg (1968: 40ff.); Fornara (1983: 190-193); Demandt (1989: 3).

Some of these writings were works of literature created for their own sakes, others are instruments drawn up for the benefit of scholarly or literary activities. A later group of writings consists of encyclopedic texts in which knowledge about all kinds of subjects is assembled from previous literature and transmitted in the form of catalogues. Two examples have been discussed in the preceding section—the *Fab.* by Hyg. and the *Liber Memorialis* by Ampelius—and a third work that incorporates lists is the *Bibl.* by Apd.[69] Information contained in this type of encyclopedic collection appears to have been used by other writers, such as Ovid or Clement Al. and the Ps.-Clements. The latter incorporate several mythographical lists in their writings in order to illustrate the foolishness of Greek religion and culture.[70]

The contents of most papyri are similar to the lists in the encyclopedic writings: whereas some catalogues may be compared to lists in Apd. *Bibl.* (cf. commentary on **59-61**, **63**, **69**, seventh list), it is the *Fab.* by Hyg. that provides parallels to almost all the catalogues. **61**, **63**, **66**, the seventh list of **69**, and **72**, in particular, share some rare names or versions or subjects with the *Fab.* On the one hand, this suggests a close link between some papyri and the Greek source of Hyg. On the other, as Fowler remarks after comparing Hyg. and **61** (p. 47), "... there are substantial divergences as well, and these very papyri demonstrate how much mythography has vanished without trace, making source criticism futile." Furthermore, lists with the same theme are often put together in Hyg. whereas the order of catalogues in the papyri seems more arbitrary. This difference may, however, be caused by the scant remains of most papyri.

It appeared in the preceding part of this chapter that many lists may have a connection with learned research, and traces of scholarship are still visible:

- several lists are ordered alphabetically, cf. lists **61**, **64**, **70** and perhaps part of **68**. This principle of organization was probably first put to use by scholars (see ch. 1, n. 8);

[69] For more examples see Regenbogen (1950: 1479-1482), who gives a survey of the origin and nature of catalogues, the later compilation of these lists into encyclopedic collections, and their changing use or function from "Hilfsmittel für gelehrte Forschung" or "Arbeits-Hilfsmittel" to "Lehrmittel".

[70] See esp. **64** and cf. **58**, **67-70**. For Ovid and his usage of mythical handbooks, see also Häussler (1984: n. 21). Cf. p. XV for Parthenius, who made a collection of stories meant to be used by the poet Gallus.

- the whole catalogue of warfare and weapons in 68 creates a learned impression: it provides many alternative versions and three times mentions a source by name. Also, in view of the preceding historical lists, the editor regards it as a characteristic product of Alexandrian erudition. It is indeed probable that this text is an extract from a learned work in which more sources were indicated by name instead of by references such as 'some say ... others ...'; the presence of critical signs in the margin suggest that the papyrus is a scholar's text.
- the third catalogue of 69 has obscure explanations of epithets and employs quotations, and 70 contains some obscure myths and references to sources.

Moreover, many lists have parallels that are attributed to or said to go back to scholars such as Aristotle, Apollodorus of Athens or Philodemus (cf. e.g. 59, 63, 64, 67 and 69). It thus appears that the majority of the catalogues are related to the lists in Hyg. and have certain but remote links with scholarship.

The last point of interest concerns the function and readership of the catalogues. The physical aspects of the papyri give only few indications about owners or readers: most papyri are written by experienced writers and only a small part of the catalogues is found on the back of documents, thereby suggesting private usage. One of these texts is 60, which incorporates the personal address *προεκθήcομαί coι*: it is possible that the catalogues in this papyrus were compiled by the writer for an acquaintance's personal use. Only a few papyri provide other clues about their owners and function. 66, containing mythical lists and sentences by the Seven Wise Men, probably stems from a school context, and the same seems to hold for the unpublished papyrus and perhaps for 58 and 73.[71] The presence of critical signs in the margin and the historical character of the contents of 68 suggest that this papyrus was owned by a scholar involved or interested in historical research.

We have seen above that the contents of the papyri are most similar to the *Fab.* of Hyg. and comparable collections. The information transmitted in all these writings may be used in order to facilitate research, to explain, understand or compare other texts. The lists form an encyclopedic body of knowledge which may be consulted and from which material may be drawn for use by, for example, teachers, students, scholars, rhetoricians, or writers (cf. n. 70).

---

[71] For writing exercises which include mythical names, cf. p. 119 and esp. n. 4.

CONCLUSIONS

At the end of this study, we return to the central question formulated in the Introduction: are the papyrus texts written in order to make it unnecessary for people to read the original writings on which the papyrus texts are based? If so, are the papyrus texts perhaps written for the same purposes as the books of Apd. and Parthenius (cf. p. XIV)? Before answering these questions, a succinct and necessarily simplified picture will be sketched of the development of ancient compendia[1] in order to provide an intellectual background for Apd. and Parthenius on the one hand, and the papyri on the other.

Compendia were first made on a large scale by the Peripatetics and Alexandrians: they gathered together and arranged all relevant facts and details about a given subject for scientific and literary purposes.[2] In the early Empire compendia were increasingly in vogue and came to be used and read both for practical purposes and for their own sakes. As far as these later compendia are concerned, one may distinguish certain tendencies: on the one hand, handbooks were written that offered the reader easily accessible information without listing all the variants and details. A certain encyclopedic mentality speaks from such books: information about the world or about a particular area is assembled and systematically organized, so that the reader may easily master that body of knowledge. An obvious example is the *Bibl.* of Apd. first mentioned in the Introduction p. XIV. This survey of the mythical world consisting of genealogically arranged stories is a comprehensive mythographic digest of earlier writings explicitly offered to the reader instead of these writings. The *Fab.* of Hyg., which consists of mythical genealogies, catalogues and narratives partly arranged by subject matter, also belongs to this type of literature. It is more

[1] The word compendium is used in the sense of a writing in which material on a given subject or range of subjects is collected and presented in concise form. Compendia thus include both collections of excerpts adopted verbally from previous literature and the more original products of authors (for the difference between author/compiler, cf. p. 85 n. 1). For more extensive information on compendia, cf. Wendel (1935: 1352ff.) and Fornara (1983: 190-192).

[2] For the compendia of the Peripatetics and Alexandrians, cf. Wendel (1935: 1355-1357), Pfeiffer (1968: 67ff.) and Fornara (1983: 190). See also Schepens (1996: 403-404), who points out that scholar poets like Callimachus composed and used such compendia for their literary products.

comprehensive than the *Bibl.* as it encompasses not only mythical but also bits of historical and geographical knowledge.[3] On the other hand (besides such handbooks), we also find specialized thematic collections assembling and preserving rare information. Some of these compendia were drawn up for practical purposes, for example, the *Facta et dicta memorabilia* by Valerius Maximus and Parthenius' *Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων*, two writings composed in order to function as a storehouse of material for other people such as rhetoricians or poets.[4] Other examples are the works of paradoxography, collections of natural wonders, marvellous matters, and astonishing facts, such as Antigonus of Carystus' *Ἱστοριῶν παραδόξων συναγωγή*, Phlegon's *Περὶ θαυμασίων*, or the related *Καινὴ ἱστορία* by Ptolemaeus Chennus.[5] It has been suggested that it is likely that some of these writings were used as reference books by scholars and poets, and that others were probably composed and read for their own sakes, being both instructive and entertaining.[6] We should of course be aware of the fact that the actual usage and readership of such writings may have been or become different over the course of time from the intended function and audience. This happened, for instance, with historical epitomes in general: they were first created as a kind of working tool/aid for personal use by writers, scholars and students, but in the first centuries of our era were read by many people instead of the

[3] For Apd. and Hyg. cf. p. 25ff., 151ff. and App. One.

[4] For Parthenius, cf. p. XIVf. and for V.Max., cf. his preface: *Urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna, quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt quam ut breuiter cognosci possint, ab illustribus electa auctoribus digerere constitui, ut documenta sumere uolentibus longae inquisitionis labor absit.* The collection of V.Max. made in the early first century AD was epitomized in its turn by Julius Paris (fourth century?) in order to provide orators and declaimers with *exempla*, cf. Carter (1975: 29). Although V.Max. clearly states the purpose of his compendium in this preface, it is not cited together with the prefaces of Apd. and Parthenius in my Introduction because the contents—examples of people's deeds, sayings and attitudes positioned in time between Romulus and Tiberius—are not comparable to the contents of the papyri.

[5] A great deal of information on paradoxography may be found in Schepens (1996: 375-409).

[6] For the cultural context and purpose of Ptolemaeus Chennus' collection (late I AD), cf. Tomberg (1968: 54-62), and for the socio-cultural environment and goal of other paradoxographic writings, see Schepens (1996: 403-409).

epitomized writings.[7] So much for this bird's-eye view of the origin and development of ancient compendia and historical epitomes. I will now review the precise nature of the papyrus texts and the purposes for which they were written linking them where possible to the literary products and tendencies just mentioned.

The first chapter has shown that the character of the papyri with *hypp.* of tragedies and comedies may differ widely. Although the learned, descriptive and metrical *hypp.* do contain an abridged version of a play's contents or its performance and selections of didascalic material, both the content and the position suggest that these *hypp.* were meant to introduce the plays or provide information about them. It is unlikely that they were written to be read instead of the plays themselves. Their character is entirely different from the compendia and historical epitomes discussed above.

The other two types of *hypp.* preserve condensed versions of plays transmitted in comprehensive alphabetically ordered collections. As the Menandrean prose *hypp.* consist of summaries of the comedies accompanied by didascalic information and an appreciation of the play, the collection may have had an introductory function or it may have been written in order to provide people interested in Menander's comedies with an inventory (cf. p. 44). It does not seem to have been designed to make the reading or watching of comedies superfluous. The narrative *hypp.* consist of independent retellings of tragedies unaccompanied by other information; they may easily be read without the text of the plays, or even instead of them, although they do not reproduce the structure of the play, the order of events or the precise contents. Yet the organization of the material, which is the same as in the collection of Menandrean prose *hypp.*, suggests that the collection was once written for a practical purpose. The author probably aimed to produce a kind of survey of the main mythical events and persons occurring in specific tragedies: the author and/or other readers and users of the collection did not have to read or consult the tragedies to obtain the information they needed for some reason or another. Hereafter, the collection may have experienced a similar expansion of

[7] This development is sketched by Fornara (1983: 191-192) who mentions, among other things, the epitome of Livy made by C. Vibius Maximus in the first century AD as an example of a 'literary' epitome. See also the literature mentioned in n. 68 p. 154. Parthenius' collection may have undergone a similar change in use, cf. p. XV n. 9.

function to the historical epitome and perhaps Parthenius' book: it may have become read for its own sake.[8]

Almost none of the Homeric *hypp.* and Callimachean *diegeses* were written in order to supplant the reading of the original poetry. Some of the Homeric *hypp.* are accompanied by glossaries or other material that indicate an introductory or auxiliary function. These texts were obviously meant to be read or used in addition to the Homeric text itself. Some *hypp.* stem from a school context as may be deduced from the hands: they have been used for educational purposes. Occasionally, a papyrus (cf. 34) contains *hypp.* which may have been composed as a substitute for the Homeric text, though such a usage cannot be proved. More obvious examples of Homeric summaries meant to be read instead of Homer occur in Apd., Hyg. and the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina*.[9]

Several arguments suggest that the *diegeses* of Callimachus' poems are introductory or secondary texts to be read before or while reading Callimachus: on the one hand, some of the *diegeses* are so concise that they are unlikely to have been read for their own sakes; on the other, one papyrus contains learned information not found in the original poem. The *diegeses*, like the Homeric *hypp.*, seem to have been composed in addition to the original poems; they form part of a subsidiary literature and are in this respect perhaps comparable to the historical epitome that was intended for a writer's or scholar's personal use.

The papyri discussed in the third chapter preserve parts of a collection of mythical stories linked to Homer, the MH collection. This collection was probably meant to be read instead of more learned or extensive writings, whose contents it transmits in a condensed form. In this respect, it is comparable to the writings of Apd. and Hyg. On the other hand, it is unlikely that the collection was composed to be read for its own sake: it constitutes a mythographical commentary on Homer. Whether people read it separately from Homer cannot be deduced from the papyri.

All the papyri with mythical catalogues seem to preserve digested information. This group of papyri is obviously most akin to the com-

[8] The development sketched is hypothetical, but pap. 9 with two *hypp.* in a thematic order may point in this direction, cf. p. 31, where other secondary uses are mentioned as well.

[9] These Homeric summaries are more concise than the *hypp.*, they are not divided into separate books and do not contain *incipits*.

pendia mentioned above: many catalogues reveal traces of the learned writings of the Peripatetics and Alexandrians, and of other antiquarian collections, and the majority of the lists are similar to catalogues in the *Fab.* of Hyg. It is impossible to determine the precise origin, function and purpose of the catalogues in the papyri, but they enable people interested in mere names or phenomena to do without reading the more extensive writings from which the lists are compiled. Yet the lists were probably not meant to be read in their own right.

Now that we have dealt with the issue of purpose, we will investigate whether the papyrus texts can pass for readers' digests. The term 'reader's digest' is used in the sense of 'a digested collection of information consisting of, for example, excerpts, summaries or other material derived from or based on earlier writings, which is meant to be read for its own sake'.[10] Keeping this definition in mind, it appears that the papyrus texts cannot be called readers' digests: the papyri do contain several kinds of condensed versions of texts based on previous literature, but most of the texts do not seem to have been intended as independent reading matter.[11] Most of our subliterary papyri seem to have helped the readers to acquire information on or form a picture of the literature they were reading or about to read. These papyrus texts have an auxiliary or introductory character, whereas the others reveal an auxiliary or encyclopedic nature: the collections of catalogues and narrative *hypp.* may have been used as a kind of reference book.

Another issue related to the character of the papyri is the question of their readership and social context. The owners or writers of one group of papyri may easily be identified thanks to their format and handwriting: several Homeric *hypp.* (30-33, 37, 39) are obviously school texts, and two or three papyri with narrative *hypp.* (3, 13 and perhaps 8) were written by students. Although the presence of glosses in two other papyri with Homeric *hypp.* (the codices 29, 42) also suggests a school environment, the format and practised hands do not

[10] This meaning is based both on the definition of digest in the Oxford English Dictionary—1. "A digested collection of statements or information; a methodically arranged compendium or summary of literary, historical, legal, scientific, or other written matter"—and on the character of the well-known *Reader's Digest* series.

[11] Even if the collection of narrative *hypp.* was read for its own sake, it was probably not written for this purpose, cf. above. The only papyrus which may be called a reader's digest is 34 (cf. p. 83).

point in that direction. A second group of papyri provides some clues about its owners: the learned and the descriptive *hypp.* (20-22) and the *diegeses* papyrus 44 may have been scholars' texts in view of their contents and/or hands and employment of abbreviations. This certainly holds true for 68, the papyrus with semi-historical catalogues and critical signs in the margin.

Less easily identifiable are the readers or owners of the other papyri. The texts are written in hands varying from calligraphic or elegant to rapidly written semi-cursive. Some papyri stem from quite handsome (cf. e.g. *diegesis* 46, MH 56, list 59) or professionally copied editions (cf. e.g. narrative *hyp.* 12, Hom. *hypp.* 38, 40, MH 52, lists 68, 69), but the hands of most texts suggest that they could have been copied by or for individuals for their own use. A similar conclusion applies in view of the material that preserves our texts: two thirds of the narrative *hypp.*, more than half of the Homeric *hypp.*, and one third of the catalogues are written on papyri that had been used before or again.[12] Whereas the codices and the papyri with blank backs may either belong to an institution's collection[13] or to individual persons, it is likely that the recycled papyri are private copies. Yet this does not enable us to identify their owners:[14] did they belong to literary or scholarly circles? Or should we imagine a more widespread

[12] Remarkably enough the MH stories are never written on the back of previously used papyri. The following survey presents a more detailed picture:
- six of the narrative *hypp.* are written on papyri with blank backs, the other twelve are written on the backs of previously used papyri or they have been reused themselves;
- the other ten dramatic *hypp.* are written in three papyrus codices, on six papyri with blank backs, and once on the back of an account;
- the Homeric *hypp.* are copied on one ostracon, in three papyrus codices, two papyri with blank backs and eight times on the backs of documents;
- the Callimachean *diegeses* are found in one papyrus codex, two papyri with blank backs, once on the back of a document, and one papyrus of which the front is blank except for one line of writing;
- the MH stories are written in one parchment codex, two papyrus codices, one ostracon, five papyri with blank backs and one papyrus reused for another text;
- eleven catalogues are written on papyri with blank backs (in one case a blank front) and six appear on papyri which have been used before or are used again.

[13] For collections of papyri kept in temples and gymnasia, cf. Krüger (1990: 153-161).

[14] Cf. Stephens (1994: 414) for the readership of the novel fragments.

and popular readership?[15] One may be inclined to associate the papyrus texts with Roman society of the first two or three centuries AD. The elite section of that society attached great value to literary and mythical knowledge and it seems to have achieved this knowledge in an easy way by means of compendia and other such sources.[16] However, this tendency stands in contrast to the picture which emerges from our papyrus texts because these were probably not meant to be read in their own right instead of the original literary writings.

To summarize, although this was the hope at the beginning of this research, neither the papyri nor the ancient testimonia allow us to determine the precise socio-historical context of the papyri apart from the school and scholar's texts. However, more conclusive information has been assembled in this study about the contents and character of the papyri and about their relationship with other literature. Further comparative research drawing upon the present results may produce a less tentative picture.

---

[15] In trying to answer this question, we should not forget that our corpus of papyri consists of 74 pieces dating from the first to the sixth centuries AD, though the majority (about 54) are assigned to the second or third centuries. As far as their provenance is concerned: 29 papyri are of unknown origin, 36 come from Oxyrhynchus, and the other nine stem from Antinoopolis, Aphroditopolis, Hermopolis, Panopolis, Tebtunis, Fayum (?), and Upper Egypt.

Apart from our knowledge about literary school texts, it is hard to trace the course of literary culture in Egypt, cf. Treu (1986: 1-2) and Bagnall (1993: 102-104). Most information about individual authors, scholars and scribes is collected for Oxyrhynchus, cf. Turner (1956: 141-146 and 1975: 1-13) and Krüger (1990: 192ff.). See also Wouters (1975: 6ff.) for a survey of Greek literature in Egypt, and Parca (1991: 95-112) for a general discussion of literary culture in Roman Upper Egypt.

[16] For this mentality, see Tomberg (1968: 40ff.), Horsfall (1979: 35)—cf. ch. 2 n. 47—, Rusten (1982: 367), Schepens (1996: 403-409), and the texts by Petron. *Sat.* 39.3, 48, 50-52; Ptol. Chenn. 151a 24-30; Sueton. *Tib.* 56 and 70; Sen. *Ep.* 27. 5-7. The last text illustrates another way of transmitting information: slaves instead of books refresh the memory of Calvisius Sabinus. However, the Romans were not alone in achieving knowledge in an easy way, cf. the modern *Bluffer's Guides*, for example, *Bluff your way in Literature/Opera/Poetry*.

APPENDIX ONE

NOTES ON THREE MYTHOGRAPHIC WRITINGS

This appendix contains additional information on the following mythographic writings: Ps.-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* (henceforth Apd. *Bibl.*), Ps.-Hyginus' *Fabulae* (henceforth Hyg. *Fab.*) and Parthenius' Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων. Each section consists of some general observations on the contents followed by remarks on syntax and vocabulary. There is also a section on the epitomes and readership of Apd.[1]

1 Ps.-Apollodorus' Bibliotheca

1.1 Contents[2]

The narrator appears throughout the book: we often see remarks in the first person plural and sometimes singular, especially at the beginnings and endings of chapters: 3, 1, 1 ... δεδηλώκαμεν, ἐχομένως λέγωμεν καὶ τὰ περὶ Ἀγήνορος; 3, 1, 4 ... ὕcτερον ἐροῦμεν; 3, 3, 2 τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶν τῆc Εὐρώπηc ἀπογόνων μέχρι τοῦδέ μοι λελέχθω. The stories are clearly arranged by a narrator, who refers forwards and backwards to other passages. He often mentions several versions of (parts of) a story, most times without expressing his opinion about them,[3] e.g. 1, 9, 19 Ἡρόδωροc ... φηcι ... Φερεκύδηc ... λέγει ... Δημάρατοc ... παρέδωκε· Διονύcιοc ... φηcὶ ... See also, e.g. 1, 5, 2; 1, 8, 4-5; 2, 1, 3; 3, 5, 6; 3, 8, 2. Instead of such precise references, we more often find vague remarks, e.g. 1, 9, 21 on Phineus: ἔνθα ᾤκει Φινεὺc

---

[1] For a discussion of the readership of Parthenius and Hyg., cf. p. XV and p. 153. Although it would have been more profitable to examine a vast range of mythographic texts, limits of time and space necessitated a selection. The contents of Apd. *Bib.* and Hyg. *Fab.* are most similar to the papyri, and Parthenius' writing is chosen primarily in view of its preface (cf. p. XIV). None of the following paragraphs pretends to be exhaustive.

[2] A general introduction on Apd. *Bibl.* is given on p. 26ff. Parts of the book are discussed on p. 70ff. and p. 108ff. The text is quoted from the ed. by Wagner (1894) but the paragraph numbers also correspond with those in the text of Frazer (1939).

[3] Exceptions are 2, 5, 11 on the apples of the Hesperides (ταῦτα δὲ ἦν, οὐχ ὥc τινεc εἶπον ἐν Λιβύῃ, ἀλλ'...) and 3, 14, 1 on the arbiters appointed by Zeus.

μάντις τὰς ὄψεις πεπηρωμένος. τοῦτον οἱ μὲν Ἀγήνορος εἶναι λέγουσιν, οἱ δὲ Ποσειδῶνος υἱόν· καὶ πηρωθῆναί φασιν αὐτὸν οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ θεῶν ... οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ Βορέου καὶ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν ... τινὲς δὲ ὑπὸ Ποσειδῶνος. In these cases the narrator might refer to particular sources but he might also point to the tradition in general. References to a past or present time like 1, 9, 17 *ἔτυχε δὲ ἡ Λῆμνος ἀνδρῶν τότε οὖσα ἔρημος*; 1, 9, 26 ... *ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν τῆι θυσίαι σύνηθές ἐστι σκώπτειν...* also seem to be elements of the traditional story. The quotations of verses found in 2, 4, 2; 3, 4, 4 and 3, 6, 7 are probably interpolations.

1.2. Syntax and vocabulary[4]

Although many versions of a story are recorded, indirect discourse is generally restricted to one or two sentences (3, 7, 7 shows a longer passage), whereafter the story is resumed in direct discourse. There is one instance of direct speech in 1, 9, 16 (cf. *Epit.* 6, 3-4). The text consists mainly of single sentences, but compound ones with all kinds of subordinate clauses occur as well. Sentences and clauses are primarily connected by *δέ* and *καί*, and in a decreasing degree by *μέν-δέ*, *γάρ*, *οὖν* (100 times, of which 65 times after *μέν*), *τε* and *ἀλλά*. Instead of these conjunctions we also see demonstratives or words like *διό* or *ὅθεν*. In the subordinate clauses several moods and tenses are used whereas the finite verbs of the main sentences are chiefly indicatives of past and present tense. The present indicatives are not only used in descriptions or in remarks of the author on sources, variants, or explanations, but also in the narrative parts without distinction from the aorist indicatives. A comparison of several passages with the same subjects and vocabulary shows that the tenses are used quite arbitrarily.[5] All forms of the infinitive and participle occur, though the circumstantial participles are most numerous.

Adjectives, adverbs, a few negations (sometimes in litotes, e.g. 3, 5, 8 *οὐ μικρὰ συμφορὰ*) and many pronouns occur. Especially the demonstrative pronouns and *αὐτός* are numerous, cf. 3, 9, 2 ... *Ἀταλάντη ἐγένετο. ταύτης ὁ πατὴρ ἀρρένων παίδων ἐπιθυμῶν ἐξέθηκεν αὐτήν.* The article is also used as a demonstrative, and *ὅστις* is employed with definite sense.

---

[4] For a discussion of the syntax and vocabulary, see Wagner (1894: LI-LX); Robert (1873: 41-44); Carrière/Massonie (1991: 9-12 incl. n. 11, pp. 152-153).

[5] Cf. the following passages on the exposure of children: 1, 9, 8; 2, 7, 4; 3, 5, 5; 3, 5, 7; 3, 9, 2; 3, 10, 3; 3, 12, 5; and passages on married women who falsely accuse men of seduction: 2, 3, 1; 3, 13, 3; 3, 15, 3; *Epit.* 1, 18; 3, 24.

The vocabulary of Apd. is composed of everyday Attic mixed with many non-Attic forms: e.g. the author uses for example both *φυλάccω* and *φυλάττω*, *κοῦροc* and *κόροc*, *ἴδιοc* and *ἑαυτοῦ* as possessive pronouns, and *γίνομαι* instead of *γίγνομαι*. There are several rare (e.g. *ἐκτροχάζω*, *προcανέχω*), late (e.g. *περικαταλαμβανομένη*, *αἰτεῖcθαι ἵνα*, *χρύcεοc*, *χάλκεοc*, *δύο* with a dative *δυcί*, *τινὲc οἱ λέγοντεc*[6]) and many poetical words (e.g. *ἄπλετοc*, *κηδεύω*, *λάρναξ*, *cπεῖρα*, *μῆνιc*, *ποίμνιον*) and even longer phrases which must have been adopted from a poetical source (e.g. 3, 1, 4 *οἴκημα καμπαῖc πολυπλόκοιc πλανῶν τὴν ἔξοδον*; 1, 6, 3 *πολλὴν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ cτόματοc πυρὸc ἐξέβραccε ζάλην*). Certain words, irrespective of words like *γαμέω*, *γεννάω* and *τεκνόω*, recur frequently, for instance the adverbs *πάλιν*, *αὖθιc*, *ὕcτερον*, *τότε*; they are a result of the chronological arrangement.

Concerning word order, a verb often separates words that belong together: e.g. 1, 1, 1 *Οὐρανὸc πρῶτοc τοῦ παντὸc ἐδυνάcτευcε κόcμου*; 2, 4, 4 ... *εἰc τὴν Πελαcγιῶτιν ἐχώρηcε γῆν*; Hyperbaton is seen in 1, 9, 1 *ὡc δὲ ἐγένοντο κατὰ τὴν μεταξὺ κειμένην θάλαccαν Cιγείου καὶ Χερρονήcου* ...[7] The antithetical arrangement with *οὐ-ἀλλά* occurs, most times when two versions of something are given, but the *μέν-δέ* construction is everywhere present: e.g. 1, 1, 6-7 *ὀργιcθεῖcα δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοιc 'Ρέα παραγίνεται μὲν εἰc Κρήτην, ὁπηνίκα τὸν Δία ἐγκυμονοῦcα ἐτύγχανε, γεννᾶι δὲ ἐν ἄντρωι τῆc Δίκτηc Δία. καὶ τοῦτον μὲν δίδωcι τρέφεcθαι Κούρηcί τε καὶ ταῖc Μελιccέωc παιcὶ νύμφαιc, 'Αδραcτείαι τε καὶ Ἴδηι. αὗται μὲν οὖν τὸν παῖδα ἔτρεφον τῶι τῆc 'Αμαλθείαc γάλακτι, οἱ δὲ Κούρητεc ἔνοπλοι ἐν τῶι ἄντρωι τὸ βρέφοc φυλάccοντεc τοῖc δόραcι τὰc ἀcπίδαc cυνέκρουον, ἵνα μὴ τῆc τοῦ παιδὸc φωνῆc ὁ Κρόνοc ἀκούcηι. 'Ρέα δὲ λίθον cπαργανώcαcα δέδωκε Κρόνωι καταπιεῖν ὡc τὸν γεγεννημένον παῖδα*. After the first *μέν-δέ*, we find a double antithesis: *μέν* - *μὲν οὖν-δέ* - *δέ*. Besides, a chiastic arrangement appears within this construction, Curetes - nymphs, nymphs - Curetes. Another instance of chiastic order is e.g. 3, 7, 1 *Εὐάδνη, ἡ Καπανέωc μὲν γυνὴ θυγάτηρ δὲ Ἴφιοc*.

Sometimes we see two words or expressions instead of one, e.g. 2, 5, 1 *ἀνδρὶ χερνήτηι*; 2, 5, 11 *ξένον ἄνδρα*; 2, 3, 1 *ἦν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἑνὶ ἀλλὰ πολλοῖc οὐκ εὐάλωτον*. Words are sometimes repeated within small passages: 1, 9, 16 *οὗτοc ὤικει ἐν 'Ιωλκῶι, τῆc δὲ 'Ιωλκοῦ Πελίαc ἐβαcίλευcε μετὰ Κρηθέα, ὧι χρωμένωι περὶ τῆc βαcιλείαc* ... *τὸ μὲν*

[6] Cf. Radermacher (1947) who mentions many Koine expressions in Apd.
[7] For more examples, cf. Wagner (1891: 90-91). See also Schöne (1925: 167ff.).

οὖν πρῶτον ἠγνόει τὸν χρηcμόν, αὖθιc δὲ ὕcτερον αὐτὸν ἔγνω; 1, 9, 23 ... *πρὸc αὐτοὺc μαχομένουc πρὸc ἀλλήλουc προcιὼν ἀνῄρει*; At the end of 1, 1, 4 and the beginning of 1, 1, 5 *ἀρχή* occurs three times within two sentences. On the other hand, variation is found as well: in 1, 1, 6 and 7 Zeus is indicated by the following words: *Δία* (twice), *τοῦτον, τὸν παῖδα, τὸ βρέφοc, τοῦ παιδόc*.

1.3 The epitomes

Because of some overlap between the two epitomes, the *Epitoma Vaticana* and the *Epitoma Sabbaitica* (cf. p. 26), and the manuscripts of the *Bibl.*, it is possible to describe the nature of the epitomes. A comparison of the *Epitoma Vaticana* and the *Bibl.* shows us that the epitome sticks, in general, to the original text, but sometimes omits certain chapters, sentences, or words. Catalogues are often omitted or severely abridged. Instead of recording all variants, the epitome usually provides one version without naming its source. The epitome simplifies the word order (e.g. it removes hyperbaton[8]), adds some names or explanations (e.g. instead of *αὐτόc* or *θεόc*, we see a proper name) or words like *καὶ δή, γοῦν*, and variates the tense of the indicatives of the main sentences. The addition of *ὅτι* before the text summarized does not change the grammatical construction, but it reminds us that we are dealing with a summary.

The *Epitoma Sabbaitica* differs from the Vatican summary because it does not keep the order of stories as told in the *Bibl.* It is further quite similar, but it does not change the tenses of the indicatives, it does not add *ὅτι*, and it does not omit each catalogue. Remarkable are the many present indicatives found in the *Epitome*, especially in the part which summarizes the *Il.*: *Epit.* 4, 2-7 includes only present indicatives in the main sentences: thirty in a sequence.[9] This might be caused by the work on which this text has been based, cf. p. 71.

1.4 Readership

The introductory epigram cited on p. XIV clearly states the encyclopedic purpose of the *Bibl.*: the reader is invoked to draw his entire

---

[8] Cf. Wagner (1891: 90-91).

[9] An examination of *Bibl.* books one and three showed that the finite verbs of the main sentences are never more than eight present indicatives in a sequence.

mythical knowledge from this writing and to discard the original poetical works. But for what kind of reader was the *Bibl.* actually composed? In his article "On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*", VdValk[10] has attempted to determine "the general character and the kind of public" (101) for which the *Bibl.* was destined. He argues that the *Bibl.* aimed at decency[11] and therefore (102) "was originally destined for young readers let us say for use in schools (12)." Note 12 runs as follows:

> It is likely that Bibl. did not only make alterations for the sake of decency, but also modified details of the original stories which he considered too crude. We refer to Bibl. I, 136 (*sic*). As we know Medea's children were either killed by herself or by the Corinthians. Bibl., however, says of the children *Κορίνθιοι ...... αὐτοὺϲ κατετραυμάτιϲαν*.[12] For further instances, cf. also below.

He adduces several examples in which words concerned with love, sex, and violation, or passages which are presumably too crude are avoided (see my enumeration below). Yet these examples are not persuasive because there remain hundreds of passages which deal with seductions, rape, killing, suicide, etc. VdValk tries to explain this inconsistency on p. 104:

> we must leave room for individual treatment. Man is a being that is not consistent, as can often be observed in orthographical matters. Therefore, we need not be surprised when Bibl. sometimes retains details which he has altered in other passages.

However, this statement not only ignores the overwhelming mass of 'indecent' passages, but it seems to show the inconsistency in VdValk's own way of arguing. Compare, for instance, the citation of n. 12 above with VdValk's explanation why *Bibl.* 1, 9, 24 represents Apsyrtus as a child cut to pieces by his own sister, whereas A.R. shows Apsyrtus as one of the Colchian commanders slain by Jason (116-117):

> We must not forget that Bibl. was destined for a young public. To their minds the story of a child cut to pieces was no doubt more fas-

[10] In this paragraph 'VdValk' refers to Van der Valk (1958).

[11] The concern for decency has previously been propounded by Robert (1873: 35ff.), but was denied by Schwartz (1894: 2880).

[12] The words *Κορίνθιοι δὲ αὐτοὺϲ ἀναϲτήϲαντεϲ κατετραυμάτιϲαν* in *Bibl.* 1, 9, 28 (= I, 146 not 136) are part of a variant version told in addition to the story that Medea kills her children: ... *τοὺϲ δὲ παῖδαϲ οὓϲ εἶχεν ἐξ Ἰάϲονοϲ, Μέρμερον καὶ Φέρητα, ἀπέκτεινε*. So, the *Bibl.* preserves the crude version as well.

> cinating than the more sophisticated version of Ap. Rh. If we pay attention to this fact, we understand that Bibl. will have a preference for versions of this kind.

Other obvious examples of this kind of subjective reasoning occur on pages 101-103, 116-117, 119, 130, 153 and in notes 109, 171, 177, 187, 217, and 234. To conclude, VdValk's statements on the general character and the kind of public for which the *Bibl.* was destined are mere arbitrary speculation. We do not have any evidence about the readership of Apd. We may only infer from the preface that this book was written for people who were interested in the traditional mythological stories and who did not want to, or were not able to, read the original literature. This group could have included all kinds of people: students, teachers, writers, and so on.[13] They may have read the *Bibl.* from beginning to end, or they may have selected certain passages.

2 Ps.-Hyginus' Fabulae

2.1 Contents[14]

I will first compare the Hyginean text on Athamas and his family with the version of Apd. in order to illustrate the different nature of the two writings. *Fab.* 1-5 all deal with Athamas, his wives, children, and their mutual intrigues. They partly provide the same information, partly give different versions. This results in many repetitions, e.g.: 1 *Athamas Aeoli filius habuit ... ex Ino Cadmi filia filios duos, Learchum et Melicerten*; 2 *Ino Cadmi et Harmoniae filia ... (Athamas) ... uxorem suam Ino et filium eius Melicerten ... Athamas postea, ab Iunone insania obiecta, Learchum filium interfecit. at Ino cum Melicerte filio suo in mare se praecipitauit ...*;[15] 4 *Athamas ... Inonem*[16] *uxorem, ex qua*

---

[13] Cf. Dihle (1989: 246): "Mythographische Bücher wie diese illustrieren recht anschaulich das Bedürfnis mit dem Sagenstoff vertraut zu bleiben, der sowohl der Literatur als auch der bildenden Kunst unablässig die Motive lieferte."

[14] Hyg. *Fab.* is introduced on p. 28ff. and see also p. 151ff. The text is quoted from the ed. by Marshall (1993).

[15] The end of this *fabula*, from *Athamas postea* onwards, which narrates the deaths of Learchus, Ino and Melicertes and the institution of the Isthmian games does not really fit at this place. If the passage is left out or transposed to *Fab.* 5 (where the same event is related), 2 and 3 form a continuous story as in Apd. 1, 9, 1-2: 2 relates how Ino does not succeed in killing Phrixus and Helle, and 3 tells their subsequent adventures. On *Fab.* 1-5, cf. also Breen (1991: 83-101).

duos filios ... Athamas ... Learchum maiorem filium suum interfecit; at Ino cum minore filio Melicerte ...; 5 ... *Athamas Aeoli filius ... filium suum interfecit sagittis.*

In contrast to this muddle of stories, we find a continuous story in Apd.: in 1, 9, 1 the story of Phrixus and Helle is told comparable with Hyg. 2 (without 2.5) and 3; in 1, 9, 2 the text continues with *'Αθάμας δὲ ὕστερον διὰ μῆνιν Ἥρας καὶ τῶν ἐξ 'Ινοῦς ἐστερήθη παίδων· αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ μανεὶς ἐτόξευσε Λέαρχον, 'Ινὼ δὲ Μελικέρτην μεθ' ἑαυτῆς εἰς πέλαγος ἔρριψεν.* After this Athamas settles in another country and marries Themisto. So, in these two paragraphs, the reader does not get confused by repetitions on the one hand and different stories about the same persons on the other hand. Apd. provides a more elaborate version of the deaths of Ino and her children, but in a different book: 3, 4, 3 Hera drives Athamas and Ino mad, *καὶ 'Αθάμας μὲν τὸν πρεσβύτερον παῖδα Λέαρχον ὡς ἔλαφον θηρεύσας ἀπέκτεινεν, 'Ινὼ δὲ τὸν Μελικέρτην εἰς πεπυρωμένον λέβητα ῥίψασα, εἶτα βαστάσασα μετὰ νεκροῦ τοῦ παιδὸς ἥλατο κατὰ βυθοῦ.* Ino and Melicertes are called Leucothea and Palaemon, and the Isthmian games are instituted. We have seen above that Hyg. inserted approximately the same information in the last paragraph of 2. To conclude, whereas Apd. provides his reader with a convenient selection of particular versions of stories,[17] the *Fab.* in its present form is less attractive to read due to the differing versions and the many repetitions.

The *Fab.* often refers to the previous literary tradition, most times using vague references such as 192.3 *quidam aiunt ... nonnulli quod ... sunt qui existiment...*; but sometimes authors are mentioned: 183 *huic rei auctor est Eumelus Corinthius. item quos Homerus tradit ... item quos Ouidius ...* There are two quotations of verses (14.33 and 177). Both are concerned with metamorphoses into stars and they might be later additions not made by Hyg. himself. We further see remarks in the first person, e.g. 2.5 *quam (=Ino) Liber Leucotheam uoluit appellari, nos Matrem Matutam dicimus, Melicerten autem deum Palaemonem, quem nos Portunum dicimus. huic quinto quoque anno ludi gymnici fiunt, qui appellantur* Ἴσθμια. It is likely that these remarks are added by Hyg. who wants to give information about the names the Romans use. Finally, we see references to a present time: e.g. 9.3 *at genetrix*

[16] Cf. 2 where the accusative of Ino reads "*Ino*" (*Ino* F : *inon* Φ).

[17] Although Apd. mentions elsewhere different versions of a story, he presents them in a clear way using words like 'some say ... others ...', cf. p. 164.

liberis orba flendo lapidea facta esse dicitur in monte Sipylo, eiusque hodie lacrimae manare dicuntur, 14.16 *ab Imbraso insula quae Parthenia appellata est, nunc autem Samos dicitur.*

The difference between Apd. and Hyg. is even more obvious when we look at the catalogues. In the *Fab.* many catalogues occur in separate chapters: e.g. between a story on Castor and on Tantalus (80 + 82), we find a list of suitors of Helen;[18] and from 221 onwards, catalogues (chiefly mythical) occur on all kinds of subjects, for instance 223 *Septem opera mirabilia*; 239 *Matres quae filios interfecerunt*; 252 *Qui lacte ferino nutriti sunt*; 276 *Insulae maximae.*[19] Apd., on the other hand, always incorporates the catalogues into the stories: 3, 10, 7 contains the story of Helen's birth, and the information that she was carried off by Theseus and brought back by Pollux and Castor. After this many Greek kings who want to marry her come to Sparta (3, 10, 8), which is followed by the words ἦcαν δὲ οἱ μνηcτευόμενοι οἵδε· and a long list of suitors. Hereafter the story continues with τούτων ὁρῶν τὸ πλῆθοc Τυνδάρεωc ἐδεδοίκει ...

2.2 *Syntax and vocabulary*

After these general remarks about the *Fab.*, I will now concentrate on the text. The text of the *Fab.* is based on Greek stories, which is clear from the many Greek words (cf. e.g. 2.5 Ἴcθμια, 7.4 ἀπὸ τοῦ ζητεῖν τόπον and ὅτι ἐν διόδωι ἢ ὅτι ἀμφὶ ὁδὸν αὐτὸν ἔτεκεν, 59 Ἐννέα Ὁδοί) and the Latin words and expressions which are literally translated from the Greek original, for example clauses with *coepi* plus a verb instead of the Greek aorist (e.g. 4 *coepit uelle filios eius necare*), 126.6 *mnesteras* meaning suitors (acc.) or 188.4 *aries chrysomallus.* Syntax and vocabulary show many characteristics of post-classical Latin.[20]

The narratives consist of about as many single as compound sentences, which are not always linked by a conjunction (e.g. *et, -que, at, autem, sed*), a demonstrative (e.g. *huic*), or adverb (*ita* and *itaque* occur very often). The stories are chiefly related in direct discourse; even after words like *dicitur* indirect discourse is only employed in one or

[18] All names that start with A- have been put together at the beginning of this list. For similar attempts at alphabetic order cf. 181 and 182.

[19] Many lists are probably later additions like the only stories found after 221: 258-261 derive from Servius grammaticus.

[20] Cf. Dietze (1890: 9-18) and Rose (1933: XXI-XXVII) on the language.

two sentences. Several times characters are presented speaking,[21] but long monologues or dialogues do not occur. The finite verbs of the main sentences are primarily past or present indicatives. The speeches and subordinate clauses show many other moods and tenses. Whereas negations and adjectives are not very numerous, adverbs occur more often, and pronouns are quite common.

On the one hand, we see some variation in denoting persons or things: e.g. 23.3 *Arete a coniuge* (that is Alcinous mentioned by name just before) ... *Absyrtus timens patris (= Aeeta) praecepta* ... *Colchi qui cum Absyrto uenerant, timentes Aeetam* ...; 189.3 ... *hospitis figuram* ... *speciem hospitis*. On the other hand, repetition of words and names is found far more often than variation: e.g. 187 *Alope* ... *Neptunus eam compressit. qua ex compressione peperit infantem, quem* ... *dedit exponendum. qui cum expositus esset*; 189 the main persons of this story, Procris and Cephalus, are often mentioned by name whereas this could easily have been avoided by using focalizing nouns (on this term, cf. p. 12). At the end we see a double indication, *Procrin coniugem*.

The author sometimes uses two similar words or expressions instead of one, for instance 2 *sterilitas et penuria frugum* (cf. 88); *ultro ac libens*; 130 *suauitatem atque iucunditatem*. Some double or explanatory expressions are probably caused by the incorporation of glosses,[22] e.g. 31.8 *purgare siue lustrare*, 60 *inimicum, id est fratrem*, 75 *percussisse, alias calcasse*.

3 Parthenius' Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων[23]

3.1 Contents

Parthenius of Nicaea, a greek poet brought as a prisoner to Rome in 73 or 66/65 BC,[24] wrote down thirty-six stories in prose about the

---

[21] Speech utterances occur far more often than in the other works discussed: 29, 95, 101, 125, 126, 136, 167, 171, 179, 186, 189, 190, 191, 194, 205, 220, 257, 274.13.

[22] Cf. Van Krevelen (1968: 269-275), who points to the numerous corruptions of the text.

[23] The main study on Parthenius is Mayer-G'Schrey (1898), and a new book written by J. Lightfoot will appear, cf. Introduction n. 8; I quote from the edition by Martini (1902).

[24] For a discussion of the date, cf. Bardon (1952: 344-345).

misfortunes of lovers. They are transmitted to us in a tenth-century ms., the Palatinus Gr. 398. I have not been able to detect a specific ordering of the stories apart from the fact that some stories with related subjects are put together, cf. e.g. 2 and 3 on Odysseus; 21 and 22 on girls who betray their cities to the enemy.

Several stories contain verse quotations ascribed to certain authors, cf. e.g. 11 *Περὶ δὲ Καύνου καὶ Βυβλίδος, τῶν Μιλήτου παίδων, διαφόρως ἱστορεῖται. Νικαίνετος μὲν γάρ φησι... λέγει δὲ ἔπεσι τοῖσδε·* quotation ... *λέγεται δὲ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν* (Parthenius) *οὕτως·* quotation.[25] See also 14, 21, and 34. In contrast to these precise indications of sources, elsewhere only vague references to writers, their works or to the tradition in general are found in the stories themselves: cf. e.g. 28 *Διαφόρως δὲ ἱστορεῖται περὶ Κυζίκου τοῦ †αἰνέου. οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔφασαν ... τινὲς δὲ ...* or *λέγεται δὲ καὶ* at the beginning of eight stories (6, 12, 17, 20, 21, 30, 31, 36).[26] Comparable imprecise references occur in 1, 4, 5, 11, 14-16, 18, 22, 25-27, 29, 32. On the ascriptions which refer to previous literature, cf. p. 113, n. 68.

There are several references to the present time: e.g. 26 *τοῦτο* (= *χῶμα*) *ἔτι νῦν ἠρῷιον Τραμβήλου καλεῖται* and see also 8, 9, 36, or to a time which precedes that of the narrator, e.g. 20 ... *νῆσον ... τότε θηρίων ἀνάπλεων οὖσαν*, see also 11, 14, 25 and 35. Variant versions are mentioned, cf. e.g. 28 (cited above), 14 *Κλεόβοια, ἥν τινες Φιλαίχμην ἐκάλεσαν*, or 11, 33, 34.

3.2 Syntax and vocabulary

The following survey will only briefly treat Parthenius' work. For more information, it is useful to consult the study of Mayer-G'Schrey (1898). With the exception of titles and ascriptions, it appears that most stories are connected by the particle *δέ*,[27] so that the collection forms a uniform whole. Within the stories, the connecting particles *δέ* and *καί* are most numerous, but *μέν-δέ, γάρ, μέντοι*, and *τε* occur

---

[25] The heading and ascription run as follows: *Περὶ Βυβλίδος. Ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστόκριτος περὶ Μιλήτου καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος Καύνου κτίσει.* The works mentioned here differ from those enumerated in the text. This phenomenon speaks against the authenticity of the ascriptions.

[26] From these stories 6 is the only one that has an ascription.

[27] Exceptions are 2, 4, 6, 19, 23, and 26, but Martini (1902) adds <*δὲ*> in all cases. On this subject, see Mayer-G'Schrey (1898: 61-62).

as well. Instead of these particles, forms of the demonstrative pronoun *οὗτος* also link sentences.

As a result of the numerous words referring to sources or the tradition in general, some stories use only indirect discourse (*oratio obliqua*: 11, 20, 22, 27, 30, 31, 33), and most of them have both indirect and direct discourse (1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14-18, 21, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36). The remaining eleven stories are written in direct discourse (*oratio recta*). The finite verbs of the main sentences are primarily indicatives of past tense, among which present indicatives occur.[28] In addition to the main sentences, many subordinate clauses occur in which various moods and tenses are seen. Even the optative appears regularly. All uses of the participle are found, but circumstantial participles predominate. Sometimes a genitive absolute is used instead of a circumstantial participle: e.g. 8 *παραχρῆμα δὲ τοῦ* Κελτοῦ *παραγενομένου διεξῆλθεν αὐτῶι τήν τε ἄλην τἀνδρὸς ἡ* Ἠρίππη ...[29] Different forms and uses of the infinitive are seen, and there is one adjectivum verbale (9 *ποιητέον*).

When we look at the other parts of speech, it is remarkable how many adjectives, including comparatives and superlatives, and adverb(ial expression)s occur. The narrator was particularly fond of *μάλα* (18 times), *μάλιστα* (10), *πάνυ* (12), *πολύς* (both adjectival and adverbial forms: 86), *ἔνθα δή* (14), *ὕστερον* (8) and *τῆι ὑστεραίαι* (5). Negations often occur, also in litotes, e.g. 1 *οὐκ ἐλαχίστην*; 17 *οὐ μετρίως*. All types of pronouns appear except for personal ones. *αὐτός* and a demonstrative are several times placed next to each other, e.g. 1 *ἐκεῖνος αὐτόν*. Cf. also 33 *αὐτὴν αὐτῶι*. Finally, the article is also used as a demonstrative.

Concerning word order, we sometimes see hyperbaton (e.g. 25 ... *πολὺς εἶχε πόθος*), very often antithetical arrangement with *μέν-δέ* (e.g. 13 Κλύμενος *δὲ ... γεννᾶι παῖδας, ἄρρενας μὲν* Ἴδαν *καὶ* Θήραγρον, *θυγατέρα δὲ* Ἁρπαλύκην ... *ταύτης εἰς ἔρωτα ἐλθὼν χρόνον μέν τινα ἐκαρτέρει καὶ περιῆν τοῦ παθήματος, ὡς δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ὑπέρρει τὸ νόσημα, τότε ... αὐτῆι συνῆλθεν. ἐπεὶ μέντοι γάμου καιρὸς ἦν ... παραχρῆμα μὲν ἐνεχείρισε πάνυ λαμπροὺς γάμους δαίσας. μεταγνοὺς δὲ οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον* ...) and sometimes with *οὐ-ἀλλά* (e.g.

---

[28] The proportion of past versus present indicatives differs according to the story; 13 has for instance seven present against five past indicatives, whereas past indicatives usually outnumber the present ones.

[29] The same construction occurs in the narrative *hypp.* 12 and 18.

36 ᾿Ρῆcoc ... *οὐκ ἠνέcχετο, ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν* ...), and finally a chiastic order (e.g. 27 ... *᾿Αλκινόην τὴν* Πολύβου *μὲν τοῦ* Κορινθίου *θυγατέρα, γυναῖκα δὲ* ᾿Αμφιλόχου *τοῦ* Δρύαντος.)

Parthenius' language is Attic with many Koine and some Ionic forms, cf. e.g. *γίνομαι*, and the Ionic *αὖτις* and Τροίηc. The vocabulary consists of everyday and poetical (*μείλιγμα, νόcημα, πλήττομαι*), rare (*διαcπαράττω, ἀπαίτηcις, πετρώδηc*), new (*τὸ ἐπομφάλιον, ἁρματηγός, ἐπιπροcδέομαι*) and late (*χωρίζομαι* = *abeo, ἐγενήθην* instead of *ἐγενόμην*) words. The dual is also present (*τὼ χεῖρε, φίλω ἤcτην*). In these thirty-six stories, he often uses the same expressions (cf. adjectives/adverbs mentioned above), which is only partly caused by the single theme of love; it is of course hardly avoidable that forms of *ἔραμαι, ἔρωc, ἐπιθυμία, πόθοc, ἀναιρέω*, or *διαχράομαι* often recur, but the repetition of other expressions, such as *μάλα φιλοφρόνωc* (4 times), *ἡ κόρη* (22 times), *ἐν νῶι ἔχω* + *τίcαcθαι* (3 times), or *χρόνου προϊόντοc* (6 times) could have been avoided. The author tends to use two similar words or expressions where one would have been sufficient, e.g. 3 ὃc *αὐτὸν οἰκείωc τε ὑπεδέξατο καὶ μετὰ πάcηc προθυμίαc ἐξένιζεν*; 6 *καλήν τε καὶ ἐπίχαριν*; *ἀναπυθανόμενοc καὶ ἐπιγνοὺc*; 36 *δίαιταν καὶ μονήν*.

Within a single story both repetition and variation is found: in 8, for example, the city Milete is referred to as Μιλήτωι, *τῆc πόλεωc, τὴν* Μιληcίαν and Μιλήτωι. One of the male characters is called *ὁ* Κελτόc and *ὁ βάρβαροc*, and he is also referred to by *ὁ* and *αὐτόν*. The name of the other male character, Xanthus, occurs at the end of the story several times in succession, which could easily have been avoided. In general, focalizing nouns (cf. p. 12) are used, but this could have been done far more often.

APPENDIX TWO

TABULA ILIACA CAPITOLINA AND APD. *EPIT.* 4, 3-7

The following text of the *Tabula Iliaca Capitolina* (= 1A) is quoted from Sadurska (1964) but itacisms have been corrected.

(7) *οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ τεῖχος τε καὶ τάφρον ποιοῦνται περὶ τὰς ναῦς.*

(8) *Ἀμφοτέρων δ' αὐτῶν ἐξοπλισθέντων καὶ μάχην ἐν τῶι πεδίωι συναψάντων οἱ Τρῶες εἰς τὸ τεῖχος τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς καταδιώκουσιν καὶ τὴν νύκτ' ἐκείνην ἐπὶ ταῖς ναυσὶν ποιοῦνται τὴν ἔπαυλιν.*

(9) *Τοῖς δὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀριστεῦσιν δοκεῖ βουλευσαμένοις τίν' ἀποστεῖλαι πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα. Ἀγαμέμνων δὲ δ[ω]ρεάς τε πολλὰς δίδωσι καὶ τὴν Βρισηίδα. Οἱ δὲ πεμφθέντες πρὸς αὐτὸν Ὀδυσσεύς τε καὶ Φοῖνιξ, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Αἴας, ἀπαγγέλλουσιν Ἀχιλλεῖ τοὺς λ[ό]γους τοὺς {λόγους} παρ' Ἀγαμέμνονος· ὃδ' οὔτε προσδέχεται τὰς δωρεάς, οὔτε συγχωρεῖ διαλυσάμενος αὐτοῖς βοηθεῖν.*

(10) *Οἱ δ' ἀριστ[εῖ]ς ταῦτ' ἀκούσαντες κ[ατα]σκόπους πέμπουσιν Ὀδυσσέα καὶ Διομήδην· οὗτοι δὲ Δόλωνι συναντήσαντες ὑφ' Ἕκτορος ἀπεσταλμένωι κατασκόπωι, πυθόμενοι παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν τάξιν [τῶ]ν τὸ στρατόπεδον φυλα[σ]σόντων αὐτόν τε διαφ[θε]ίρουσιν καὶ Ῥῆσον τὸν Θρακῶν, μετ' α[ὐτ]οῦ δὲ καὶ ἄλλους· καὶ λαβό[ντ]ες τὰς ἵππους ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἐλαύνουσιν.*

(11) *Ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης μάχην συνάπτουσι κ[αὶ] τῆ[ς] μ[άχ]ης ἱσταμένης [τρωθέντε]ς Ἀγαμέμνων, Διομήδης, Ὀδυσσεύς, Μαχάων, Εὐρύπυλος ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀναχωροῦσιν. Πάτροκλος δὲ πεμφθεὶς παρ' Ἀχιλλέως πυνθάνε[τα]ι Νέστορος τὰ περὶ τὴν μ[άχ]ην.*

(12 end) *Ἕκτωρ δὲ ῥήξας τὰς [εἰς στρα]τὸν πύλας εἰς τὸ τεῖχος [εἰσ]πίπτει τῶν Ἑ[λ]λήνων κ[αὶ]*

(beginning 13) *μάχην συνάπτει πρὸ [τ]ῶν νεῶν.*
(rest of 13-15) *Τῆς δ' ὁμαλῆς γινομένης*

Apd. *Epit.* 4, 3-7 quoted from the edition by Wagner (1894)

(end 7 + 8) *οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες πρὸς τοῦ ναυστάθμου τεῖχος ποιοῦνται καὶ τάφρον, καὶ γενομένης μάχης ἐν τῶι πεδίωι οἱ Τρῶες τοὺς Ἕλληνας εἰς τὸ τεῖχος διώκουσιν·*

(9) *οἱ δὲ πέμπουσι πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα πρέσβεις Ὀδυσσέα καὶ Φοίνικα καὶ Αἴαντα, συμμαχεῖν ἀξιοῦντες καὶ Βρισηίδα καὶ ἄλλα δῶρα ὑπισχνούμενοι.*

(10) *νυκτὸς δὲ ἐπιγενομένης κατασκόπους πέμπουσιν Ὀδυσσέα καὶ Διομήδην· οἱ δὲ ἀναιροῦσι Δόλωνα τὸν Εὐμήλου καὶ Ῥῆσον τὸν Θρᾶικα (ὃς πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας παραγενόμενος Τρωσὶ σύμμαχος οὐ συμβαλὼν ἀπωτέρω τῆς Τρωικῆς δυνάμεως χωρὶς Ἕκτορος ἐστρατοπέδευσε) τούς τε περὶ αὐτὸν δώδεκα κοιμωμένους κτείνουσι καὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἄγουσι.*

(11) *μεθ' ἡμέραν δὲ ἰσχυρᾶς μάχης γενομένης, τρωθέντων Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Διομήδους Ὀδυσσέως Εὐρυπύλου Μαχάονος καὶ τροπῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γενομένης,*

(end 12) *Ἕκτωρ ῥήξας τὸ τεῖχος εἰσέρχεται καὶ*

(16) Ἀχιλλεὺc παρὰ τοῦ Πατρόκλου τὰ περὶ τὴν μά[χ]ην ἀκούcαc καὶ δεο[μέν]ου βοηθεῖν αὐτόν τε [π]έμψαι τοῖc π[ερὶ νεῶν, ἰ]δὼν τὴν τοῦ Πρ[ωτεcι]λάου ναῦν καιομένη[ν πέμ]πει μετὰ τῶν Μυρμιδ[όνων] τὸν Πάτροκλον, τοὺc ἵ[ππ]ουc αὐτῶι δοὺc καὶ τοῖc [ὅ]πλοιc τοῖc αὐτοῦ καθοπλίcαc· ὃ ἰδόντεc οἱ Τρῶεc ἰθὺc ἅπαντεc φεύγουcιν. ἐν δὲ τῆι τροπῆι ταύτηι Π[άτ]ροκλοc ἄλλουc τε πολ[λο]ὺc ἀποκτείνει καὶ Cαρπηδόνα τὸν Διόc, τοὺc δὲ λοιπ[οὺ]c εἰc τὸ τεῖχοc [κατα]διώκει. Ἕκτωρ δ' αὐτὸν μ[εί]ναc ἀποκτείνει καὶ [τῶν ὅ]πλων ἐ[γ]κρατὴc γίνεται.

(17) Μ[άχ]ηc [δ]ὲ περὶ [τοῦ νεκρ]οῦ γι[νομέ]νηc

(18) Ἀν[τίλοχ]οc ἀπαγγέλ[λ]ει ἀχνύ[μενοc εἰc κ]λιcίαν Ἀχ[ι]λ[λ]έωc· ἡ [Θέτιc δ'] ἔρχεται πρὸc Ἥφαιc[τον] αἰτήcουcα παντευχί[α]ν· ὃ δ' αὐτῆι προθύμωc ποιεῖ. Οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ τὸ cῶμα τοῦ Πατρόκλ[ου ἐ]πὶ τὰ[c] ναῦc διακομίζου[c]ιν.

(19) Τῶν δ' ὅπλων ὑπὸ τῆc [Θ]έτιδοc ἐνεχθέντων [τ]ὴν Βριcηίδα Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀ[χ]ιλλεῖ δίδωcιν.

(21) Ἀχι[λ]λεὺc δὲ ε[ἰc] τὸν Cκάμανδρον καταδιώξαc Ἀcτεροπαῖον ἀποκτείνει. Ἀχιλλεὺc δὲ τὸν ἐν τῶι ποταμῶι διαφυγὼν [κί]νδυν[ον πρ]ὸc

(22) Ἕ[κ]τορα μονομ[α]χ[εῖ] κ[αὶ ἀπ]οκτείνει καὶ τὰ ὅπλ[α αὐτοῦ] λαμβάνει καὶ τὸν νεκρ[ὸ]ν ἐκδηcάμενοc ἐκ τοῦ δίφρου διὰ τοῦ πεδίου ἕλκει ἐπὶ τὰc ναῦc.

(23) Καὶ τὸν Πάτροκλον θάψαc τίθηcιν ἐπ' αὐτ[ῶι ἆ]θ[λ]ά τινα τῶν ἀριcτέων.

(24) Κα[ὶ ὁ] Πρίαμοc ἐπὶ τὰ[c] ν[αῦ]c παρ[αγ]ενόμενοc Ἕκτορα λυτροῦται παρ' Ἀχιλλέωc· ἐπανελθόντοc δὲ τοῦ Πριάμου πάλιν εἰc τὴν πόλιν, θάπτουcιν οἱ Τρῶεc καὶ τὸν τάφον αὐτοῦ καταcκευά[ζ]ουcι.

(16) *ἀναχωρήcαντος Αἴαντος πῦρ ἐμβάλλει ταῖc ναυcίν. ὡc δὲ εἶδεν* Ἀχιλλεὺc *τὴν* Πρωτεcιλάου *ναῦν καιομένην, ἐκπέμπει* Πάτροκλον *καθοπλίcας τοῖc ἰδίοιc ὅπλοιc μετὰ τῶν* Μυρμιδόνων, *δοὺc αὐτῶι τοὺc ἵππους. ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ* Τρῶες *καὶ νομίcαντες* Ἀχιλλέα *εἶναι εἰc φυγὴν τρέπονται. καταδιώξας δὲ αὐτοὺc εἰc τὸ τεῖχος πολλοὺc ἀναιρεῖ, ἐν οἷc καὶ* Σαρπηδόνα *τὸν* Διός, *καὶ ὑφ'* Ἕκτορος *ἀναιρεῖται, τρωθεὶc πρότερον ὑπὸ* Εὐφόρβου.

(17) *μάχης δὲ ἰcχυρᾶc γενομένης περὶ τοῦ νεκροῦ,*

(18) *μόλιc* Αἴαc *ἀριcτεύcας cώζει τὸ cῶμα.*

(19) Ἀχιλλεὺc *δὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀποθέμενος καὶ τὴν* Βριcηίδα *κομίζεται. καὶ πανοπλίας αὐτῶι κομιcθείcης παρὰ* Ἡφαίcτου, *καθοπλιcάμενος ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐξέρχεται,*

(21) *καὶ cυνδιώκει τοὺc* Τρῶαc *ἐπὶ τὸν* Cκάμανδρον, *κἀκεῖ πολλοὺc μὲν ἄλλους ἀναιρεῖ, κτείνει δὲ καὶ* Ἀcτεροπαῖον *τὸν* Πηλεγόνος *τοῦ* Ἀξιοῦ *ποταμοῦ· καὶ αὐτῶι λάβρος ὁ ποταμὸc ἐφορμᾶι. καὶ τούτου μὲν ὁ* Ἥφαιcτος *τὰ ῥεῖθρα ἀναξηραίνει πολλῆι φλογὶ διώξας, ὁ δ'* Ἀχιλλεὺc

(22) Ἕκτορα *ἐκ μονομαχίας ἀναιρεῖ καὶ ἐξάψας αὐτοῦ τὰ cφυρὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἅρματος cύρων ἐπὶ τὰc ναῦc παραγίνεται.*

(23) *καὶ θάψας* Πάτροκλον *ἐπ' αὐτῶι ἀγῶνα τίθηcιν, ἐν ὧι νικᾶι ἵπποιc* Διομήδης, Ἐπειὸc *πυγμῆι,* Αἴαc *καὶ* Ὀδυccεὺc *πάλῃι.*

(24) *μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα παραγενόμενος* Πρίαμος *πρὸc* Ἀχιλλέα *λυτροῦται τὸ* Ἕκτορος *cῶμα καὶ θάπτει.*

PART TWO

NOTE ON THE TEXTS

The purpose of this second part is to provide the reader with all papyrus texts discussed in chapters One to Four. Although I will record my own readings based on inspection of papyri and photographs, I do not present a new critical edition with the usual description of all traces and an exhaustive survey of readings and supplements previously proposed. The interested reader may find these matters in the editions and articles mentioned. The following information is given before the text of each papyrus:
- on the first line: number (bold) used for internal references; abbreviation used to identify the papyrus (in the case of two abbreviations, both will be given, e.g. *P.Berol.* inv. 13930 and *P.Schub.* 21); provenance (? means that the provenance is unknown; place name + ? indicates that the place of origin is probable but not certain); date in Roman numbers. Unless otherwise stated, all dates are AD and assigned.
- hereafter the *ed. pr.* is mentioned and later editions or articles (cited in short form without title). A reference to Pack is included when possible; regarding the papyri with Euripidean *hypp.*, Mertens-Pack refers to numbers in O. Bouquiaux-Simon-P. Mertens, Les témoignages Papyrologiques d'Euripide: liste sommaire arrêtée au 1/6/1990, *Pap. Lup.* 1, 1992, 95-107. The bibliographical information is not exhaustive and records primarily articles which are relevant for the constitution of the papyrus texts.
- the * (asterisk) precedes remarks on the text editions: texts are based on the first edition unless otherwise indicated. This holds also for the supplements, which are usually omitted when they are not quite certain (that is, based on or adopted from parallel sources). 'inspexi' indicates that I have inspected the papyrus, which is the case for all Oxyrhynchus papyri kept in Oxford, Cambridge and London, and the papyri in Berlin, Amsterdam and Leiden.
- 'contents' only mentions the subjects of the papyri; a fuller discussion is given in the first part of this book.

The texts are printed in a corrected and modern form, with accents and punctuation. The basis of the method is the Leiden system as summarized in the volumes of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Lectional signs present in the papyri are noted in the 'apparatus' beneath the column, where also faults of orthography, additions, erasions, etc. are mentioned. Iota adscript is printed where written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Lemmata and first-line quotations are printed bold.

Apart from some exceptions, I use a continuous line numeration (which often disagrees with former editions). Lines that are lacking have been indicated (e.g. "8 lines lost") but are not counted.

As for the papyri which I have inspected, my readings are reported when they differ from the first edition, though small differences, for instance in dots beneath letters, are not indicated. When I do not doubt my own readings, they are printed in the main text and the earlier readings in the critical notes, otherwise the reverse will be found. The critical notes are written in English except for some common Latin terms or abbreviations as *ap.*, *om.*, *coni.*, *supplevi.*

1a *P.Oxy.* 27, 2457 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. E.G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27, London 1962, 70-73 + pl. IV
re-ed. by Austin 88-89 (only *Aeolus*)
cf. Pack 454; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 126, 1982, 10-18; J. Diggle, *ZPE* 77, 1989, 11
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Alcestis, Aeolus*

. . . .

]ιολ . . . [
] . ελυcεν πα[
cυ]μφορὰν οπ[
] . χηc αὐτ[
δεδ]ακρυμεν[
ἔ]μαθεν παρ[α
παρ]αγενόμεν[οc
]ν τὸν Θάν[ατον
]εκρα και[
] . . . . . . [
τὴ]ν Ἄλκηcτι[ν
c]υγκαλυ[
] . λαβόντ[α
]αι πάληc ἆθ[λον
] . ου χάριν τ . [
] . ἐκκαλύψα[c
] . . [. .] . . [ ]
—— Αἴολοc, οὗ [ἀρ]χή·
ἡ δεινὰ καὶ δύcγνωcτα βουλ⌊εύει θεόc
ἡ δὲ ὑπόθεcιc·
Αἴολοc παρὰ θεῶν ἔχων τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων δ[υναcτεί-
αν ᾤκηcεν ἐν ταῖc κατὰ Τυρρηνίαν νήcο[ιc υἱοὺc ἓξ
καὶ θυγατέραc τὰc ἴcαc γεγεννηκώc. τ[ούτων δ' ὁ
νεώτατοc Μακαρεὺc μιᾶc τῶν ἀδελ[φῶν Κανάκηc ἐ-
ραcθεὶc διέφθειρεν· ἡ δ' ἔγκυοc γενη[θεῖcα
τὸν τόκον ἔκρυπτεν τῷ νοcεῖν πρ[
τωc· ὁ δὲ νεανίcκοc ἔπειcε τὸν πατέρ[α τὰc θυ-
γατέραc cυνοικίcαι τοῖc υ[ἱ]οῖc· ὁ δὲ cυνκ . [

μενος κλῆρον τοῦ γάμου πᾶσιν ἐξεφα̣[ίνετο.
πταίσας δὲ περὶ τὸν πά̣λον ὁ τ̣α̣ῦτα μ[ηχα-
νησάμενος ἠτύχει· τὴν γὰρ ὑπὸ τούτου ἐ̣[φθαρ-
μένην̣ ὁ κ̣λῆρος πρὸς ἄλλον συμβίωσ[ιν ἐνυμ-
φαγώ̣[γ]ει· συνδραμόντες δ' εἰς τὸ αὐτ̣[ὸ
. . υτ . . [. . ()]ν̣ τὸ μὲν γεννηθὲν ἡ τροφὸς[

2] . , high dot at left side of ε || 10] . ν̣ε̣ . . . [ed. pr. || 13] . , prob. υ || 14]αι or]ν || 15] . , ι (ed. pr.) or ν || 16] . :]ρ̣ ed. pr. || 21-22 δ[ιοικησιν ανωκησ̣εν ed. pr. : δ[υναστεί- | αν ᾤκησεν Diggle : δ[εσποτεί- | αν ᾤκησεν Kassel ap. Austin || 24 Κανάκης supplevi || 28 . [, lower part of vertical : συν-κα̣[λεσά- suppl. Barrett, Kassel ap. Austin || 29 ἐξέθη[κεν· Snell ap. Austin || 31 ἐ[φθαρ]- Luppe : [διεφθαρ-] ed. pr. || 32 ὁ om. ed. pr. || 32-33 suppl. Morel ap. Austin || 34 κ̣ο̣υτ . [. . .]ο̣ι το ed. pr. : τ̣ο̣ῦτο̣ν̣ [κ]αὶ τὸ Luppe

1b *P.Oxy.* 52, 3650 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. R.A. Coles, A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: the hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros, *BICS* Suppl. 32, 1974, esp. 8-22 and 66-70, with pl. i-ii
re-ed. by R.A. Coles, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52, London 1984, 13-17 (incl. bibliography until 1984)
cf. Mertens-Pack 454; D. Kovacs, *HSPh* 88, 1984, 47-70, esp. 47-51; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 60, 1985, 12-16; ibid., 63, 1986, 7-10; ibid., 90, 1992, 45-47 (= on ll. 39 and 52-53); ibid., 96, 1993, 6-8; M. Huys, *ZPE* 62, 1986, 9-36, esp. 12-15
* inspexi; text based on sec. ed. Coles

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Alexandros, Andromache*

Col. I *Alexandros*

. . . .

Ἀλέξαν]δ̣ρ̣[ος οὗ ἀρχή·
] καὶ τὸ κλεινὸν [Ἴ]λ̣ιον
ἡ δὲ ὑ]πόθεσις·
] Ἑκάβης καθ' ὕπνον ὄψεις
ἔ]δωκεν ἐκθεῖναι βρέφος
]ν ἐξέθρεψεν υἱὸν Ἀλέ-
ξανδρο̣[ν Π]άριν προσαγορεύσας. Ἑκά-
βη δὲ τ̣ή̣[ν ἡ]μέραν ἐκείνην πενθοῦ-
σα ἅ̣μ̣α κ̣[αὶ] τιμῆς ἀξιοῦσα κατωδύ-
ρατο μ̣ὲ̣ν̣ [τὸ]ν̣ ἐκτεθέντα, Πρίαμο̣ν̣ [δ' ἔ-
πε[ι]σ̣ε . . [. . .]ε̣λεις ἀγῶνας ἐπ' α[ὐ]τ̣ῷ κα-

ταςτῆς[ας]θα[ι.] διελθόντ[ων δὲ ἐτῶ]ν εἴ-
κοςι ὁ μὲν παῖς ἔδοξε [. . . . . . . τ]ὴν
φύςιν εἶναι βουκολ . [. . . . .]ντος,
οἱ δ' ἄλλοι νομεῖς διὰ τὴν ὑπερήφανον
ςυμβίωςιν δήςαντες ἐπ[ὶ] Πρίαμον ἀνήγα-
γον αὐτόν. . . . . . . ηθεὶς [δ]ὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δυνά-
ςτου . . . . ω[.] . . . . π . [. ()]ρειτο καὶ τοὺς δι-
αβάλλοντας ἑκάςτ[ο]υς ἔλαβε καὶ τῶν
ἐπ' αὐτῶι τελ[ο]υμέν[ων] ἀγώνων εἰάθη
μεταςχεῖν. δρόμον δὲ καὶ πένταθλον
ἔτι δὲ πὺξ †ἥττηντο, φ . . . . . . εθηρίωςε†
τοὺς περὶ Δηΐφοβον, οἵτινες ἡττῆςθαι δια-
λαβ[ό]ντες ὑπὸ δούλου κατηξίωςαν τὴν
Ἑκάβην ὅπως ἂν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνῃ. πα-
ραγενηθέντα δὲ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον
Καςς[άν]δρ[α] μὲν ἐμμανὴς ἐπέγνω
καὶ π[ερὶ τῶ]ν μελλόντων ἐθέςπιςεν,
Ἑκάβη [δὲ ἀπο]κτεῖναι θέλουςα διεκω-
λύθη. π[α]ρα[γενό]μενος δ' ὁ θρέψας αὐτὸν
διὰ τὸν κίνδυνον ἠναγκάςθη λέγειν τὴν
ἀλήθειαν. Ἑκάβη μὲν οὖν υἱὸν ἀνεῦρε

11 -ςε πο[λυτ] Luppe : -ςεν δ[ιατ]- ed. pr. || 17 ἐπερωτηθεὶς ed. pr. : ἀνερωτηθείς Bremer : ἀπολογηθείς Luppe || 18 sic Coles (ου, ω and π are quite uncertain) || 22 sic Coles, cf. his comments in re-ed. : I discern *επιδ . π . . .* *()την . . ()φ . . . . . . εθηριωςε*

Col. II *Andromache*

. . . .

. .] . . [. .] . . [*πά-*
λιν ἀπ[ῆλθ]εν [ἐπὶ τὸ χρηςτήριον μετανοήςας,
ἵνα τὸν θεὸν ἐ[ξιλάςηται. ζηλοτύπως δ' ἔ-
χουςα ἡ βας[ιλὶς πρὸς τὴν Ἀνδρομάχην
ἐβουλεύετο κα[τ' αὐτῆς θάνατον, μεταπεμ-
ψαμένη τ[ὸν Μενέλαον· ἡ δὲ τὸ παιδίον
μὲν ἐξέθηκ[εν αὐτὴ δὲ κατέφυ-
γεν ἐπὶ [τὸ Θέτιδος ἱερόν. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Με-
νέλαο[ν καὶ τὸ παιδίον ἀνεῦρον καὶ ἐκείνην
ἀπατ[ήςαντες ἤγειραν, καὶ ςφάττειν
μέλλο[ντες ἀμφοτέρους ἐκωλύθηςαν
Πηλέ[ως ἐπιφανέντος. Μενέλαος μὲν
οὖν ἀπ[ῆλθεν εἰς Cπάρτην, Ἑρμιόνη δὲ

μετε[νόηϲεν εὐλαβηθεῖϲα τὴν παρουϲίαν
τοῦ Νε[οπτολέμου. παραγενόμενοϲ δ' Ὀρέ-
ϲτηϲ τ[αύτην μὲν ἀπήγαγε πείϲαϲ, Νε-
οπτολ[έμῳ δ' ἐπεβούλευϲεν· ὃν καὶ φονευ-
θέντα [παρῆϲαν οἱ φέροντεϲ. Πηλεῖ δὲ τὸν
νεκρὸ[ν μέλλοντι θρηνεῖν Θέτιϲ ἐπιφα-
νε[ῖ]ϲα [Νεοπτόλεμον μὲν ἐπέταξεν ἐν
Δε]λφ[οῖϲ θάψαι,   Ἀνδρομάχην
δὲ με[τὰ τοῦ παιδὸϲ εἰϲ Μολοϲϲοὺϲ
ἀποϲτ[εῖλαι, αὐτὸν δ' ἀθαναϲίαν προϲδέ-
χεϲθα[ι
ταυτα[
πρ[ο]ϲωπ[
τηϲ μ[
μελε[
τον π[
δι' αὐτο[
δοῦλον[
τεταρτ[
του τη[

2 *P.Köln* 1, 1 ?, II

ed. pr. L. Koenen, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 7-18 + pl. IIIa = ed. B. Kramer-R. Hübner, *Kölner Papyri* 1, Köln-Opladen 1976, 11-13
cf. Mertens-Pack 435.1; W. Luppe, *APF* 29, 1983, 19-23

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Auge*

Αὔγη,] ἧϲ ἡ ἀρχή· [
Ἀλέαϲ Ἀθά]ναϲ ὅδε πολ[ύχρυϲοϲ δόμοϲ.
ἡ δ' ὑπό]θεϲιϲ· [
]ϲ Ἀρκαδίαϲ δ[
π]άϲαϲ κάλλει [
]αν τῆϲ Ἀλέα[ϲ
] ἡ δὲ τῆϲ πα[ννυχίδοϲ
]ϲτάϲηϲ χο[
]ϲ ὤλιϲθεν [
ἐϲθ]ῆτα πλύν[ουϲαν
πλ]ηϲίον κρή[νηϲ

]δε κατὰ τὴ[ν
θ]οινωμενο[
]. . εν[
. . . .

1 αρχηι || 4ff. for supplements, cf. ed. pr. and Luppe

3 *P.Vindob.G.* 19766 (*MPER* N.S. 3, 32) ?, II

ed. pr. H. Oellacher, *MPER* N.S. 3, Wien 1939, 52-53
re-ed. by C.G. Bastianini-W. Luppe, Una hypothesis Euripidea in un esercizio scolastico, *Analecta Papyrologica* 1, 1989, 31-36 + pl.
cf. Pack 1989; F. Angiò, *Anal. Pap.* 3, 1991, 103-104; Cribiore (1996: no. 192)
* text based on re-ed. but lines 1-5 are not printed: the first two lines are of uncertain content, ll. 3-5 contain a *chria*.

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Autolycus* I

] τὸ δρᾶμα Εὐ[ρ]ιπ(ίδου) [
] Αὐτόλυκος α[ ] [
Αὐτόλ]υκος Ἑρμοῦ . [. . .] . τιαφ[
. . . .]ων[
. . . .

3 Ἑρμοῦ χ[άρι]τι ἀφ[ελὼν / ἀφ[αιρῶν Angiò

4 *P.Oxy.* 60, 4017 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. H.M. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 60, London 1994, 15-23 + pll. V, VI
cf. Mertens-Pack 387.1
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Andromache* (fr. 1), *Bacchae* (fr. 2, l. 18ff.), *Bellerophon* (fr. 4) and other unknown plays

Fr. 1 *Andromache*

. . .
] . [
πα]ραγεν[όμενος

]ν πεἰςα[c
]. ον . . [
]. Πηλε[ῖ
]ν . . [.] . [
. . .

supplements in 2, 3 and 5 based on 1b, l. 47ff.

Fr. 2, col. I

. . .
].
]. . ο .
]ητοιμα
]. λεγον
]ο
]ενωc
]θον
]. α
]υ
. . .

col. II *Bacchae*
Top (?)
. . . .
πρεπον[
ουτουc . ιε . [
Βά[κχαι ὧν ἀρχή·
ἥ⌊κω Δ⌋ι⌊òc⌋ παῖc τή⌊ν⌋δ⌊ε Θηβαίων
χθόνα· ἡ δ' ὑπόθεcι[c·
Δι[ό]νυcον οἱ προcήκοντεc ἐν Θήβ[αιc
οὐκ ἔφ]ηcεν εἶναι θεόν· ὁ δ' αὐτοῖc τιμω[ρί-
αν] ἐπέcτηcε τὴν πρέπου[c]αν. ἐμ[μα-
νεῖc γὰρ ἐποίηcεν τὰc [Θ]η[β]αίων γ[υ-
ν]αῖκαc, ὧν αἱ Κάδμ[ου] θυγατέρ[εc
ἀ]φηγούμεναι τοὺc θι[α]cμο[ὺc] ἤγα[γον
πρὸc τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα. Κάδμοc μὲ[ν οὖν
γ]ηραλέοc [.]ηδη . . . Cεμέλη[
ωc ἐπι . [. . . . .] . . . . [
θεὸν ὀργι . [. . .] . [
.()[.]α . . [.] . [παραλαβὼν τὴν
βαcιλείαν ἐδ[υcφόρει τοῖc γινομένοιc καί
τιναc μὲ[ν τῶν Βακ]χῶν cυλλα[βὼν
ἔδηcεν, ἐπ' αὐ[τὸν δὲ τὸν] θ[εὸ]ν [ἄλλουc
ἀπέcτειλεν . [
. . . .

3 ·B || 5 να· (high stop by sec. hand?) || 6 πρεcηκοντεc || 7 l. ἔφ]ηcαν Slings (private note) : ἔφαcαν codd. || 8 εν[μα || 12 οὖν suppl. Diggle, cf. *ZPE* 77, 2ff. || 16 .()[, π[or τι[/τ . [ed. pr. || 17 βαcιλιαν || 18 cυνλα[||
20 . [, low dot

Fr. 3

Top

] . ηcπαρ[
]υτοcδε[
]αι . . . το . ε . [
] . μ̣ . πτα[
]ω̣ν . . . ερ . [
] . . . πτη[
] . . ηc̣ . τ̣η . [
. . .

1] . , right part of high horizontal, *γ* or *τ* || 3 after *αι* high horizontal, *υ* and oblique trace || 5 after *ν* perhaps *κ*; then one letter plus *ι* or *η* | . [, *ο* or *ω*

Fr. 4 *Bellerophon*

Top

cυ]μ̣φορα . [
] . φ . [. . . .]α̣cβαcε . [
] . cαc . [. .] . . α . . [
]μεταν ε̣ . [. .]ων . [
] . η . ηται . ο̣[. .]εν . [
] . C̣θ̣ε̣ν̣ε̣β̣ο . . [. . . .] . [
]τ̣ο̣π̣ουcτου . [. .] . . . . [
]λ̣ε̣ρ̣ . [. .]ν̣ . . [
]ν . [
] . φ[
. . . .

3] . ,]η (ed. pr.) or] . ε? || 4 ε . [, after ε vertical (*π* ed. pr.)

Fr. 5

. . .
] . [
]c [
3] . τουτοκ . . [
]c [
. . .

3 after *κ*: *ο* (ed. pr.) or *ρ*

Fr. 7

. .
]α . [
]λοφρ[
] . υc . [
. .

Frr. 6, 8, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 21 are blank

Fr. 10

. .
] . [
]φ . [
. .

Fr. 13

. .
] . . . . [
] . λεπω . [
. .

Fr. 15

. .
]ον̣[
]π . [
. .

Fr. 18

. .
] . κ[
. .

Fr. 20

. .
]ει[
. .

Fr. 22

. .
] . . [
]εν[
] . φα[
] . λον[
] . . . . [
. .

Fr. 23

. .
] . [
] . ν . [
]αϲ̣[
Foot?

Fr. 24

. .
] . α . [
]δ . [
]ο̣ϲ̣[
. .

Fr. 25

. .
]ω . . [
Foot?

Fr. 26

. .
]νη[
. .

Fr. 27

. .
] . [
] . [
] . [
]ο . [
. .

5 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3651 Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. H.M. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52, London 1984, 17-22 + pl. III
cf. Mertens-Pack 454.1; W. Luppe, *Eikasmos* 1, 1990, 171-177; —, *ZPE* 80, 1990, 13-15
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Bellerophon, Busiris*

διεγνωκ̣ότοϲ . [
ϲθαι προϲ̣ελθὼ[ν

ἰδίου καὶ ἀδελφ[
Βελλεροφόντη[
τὴν πρέπουϲα̣[ν
αὐ[τ]ὸϲ̣ ϲ̣υνε̣πε[
θη· νεκρὸν . [
πειν τὸν ἐχ . [
ἀπὸ τῶν Ταυρ̣[
ϲ̣α̣ντα ὑπολ̣[Βελ-
λερο]φόντην[
. .] . . δρυ . ποτα̣[
. .]ν̣δρον εξε̣[
] . ν̣ . . ε̣ι̣ο̣ . [
] . ε̣δ̣ . . [.] . . [
] . . α τ̣ὴν χ̣ώ[ραν
. .] . . . . α̣μυ . [
τ]ὰ̣ϲ πηγ̣ὰϲ . [
.]αι τὸν Βελλερ̣[οφόντην
. .] . . [τ]ῆ̣ϲ Λυκία[ϲ
. . .] τ̣ὴν ναῦν̣[
.] . κ̣ . . α̣ν· διε[
Β̣ο̣ύ̣ϲειρ̣ι̣[ϲ ϲατυρικόϲ, οὗ ἀρχή·
]ὦ̣ δα̣ῖμον ο̣[
ἡ δ' ὑπόθε̣ϲ̣[ιϲ·
] . . . α μῆλα δ̣ . [
ϲ]ά̣τυροι προ . [
. .]ε̣ρ̣ . [
.]τ̣ε̣ϲ[
] . . ι̣γυ[
.]μ̣ι̣ . [
.] . . [
] . τ̣ο̣[
.] . [
. . . .

3 ϊδιου (ϊ added in margin) || 4 marginal dash: it might relate to the preceding col. or to the previous ϊ || 7 *θη νεκ-* || 9 *των*⟦ϲ⟧ || 12 *δρυ.\ποτα/*[|| 18 *πηγὰϲ* . [Luppe (*Eikasmos* 173) : *π̣ο̣ι̣ν̣ὰϲ δ*[ed. pr. || 22 *αν διε* || 25 *δ'* || 26 *δ̣* . [(ed. pr.) preferable to Luppe's (*ZPE* 1990) λα̣[|| 27 . [, low dot and small vertical at top of line : ϲ̣[Luppe (*ZPE* 1990) not probable

6 *P.Oxy.* 3, 420 Oxyrhynchus, III

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, London 1903, 66-67 + pl. VI
cf. Pack 388; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 125, 1981, 181-187 incl. pl.; Barrett ap. Diggle (1989: 5 n. 22) and in G. Basta Donzelli, *Electra*, ed. Teubner 1995
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Electra*

. . . . τ̣ο̣ὺ̣ς̣ ἄνδραc εἰcάγειν̣ [ἐ-
κ̣έ̣λ[ε]υ̣c̣ε̣ν̣ πενιχρῶν μέν, ἀλλὰ [φι-
λοτ̣ί̣μων ξενίων μεθέξονταc̣, [αὐ-
τὸc δὲ τ̣[ὰ] πρόcφορα τῇ cπουδῇ κο-
μιῶν ἀπῆλθεν. πυθόμενοc δὲ τ̣[ὴν
α̣π̣[ορί]α̣ν ὁ̣ πρεcβύτηc ὁ τὸν 'Ορέcτη[ν
ὑπ]ε̣κ̣κ̣λέψαc ἦλθεν 'Ηλέκτρ̣α[ι
ξέν[ια] φ̣έρων ἃ τοῖc κατ' ἀγρὸν με̣[
. [ ] . ἡ χώρα προῖκα δωρεῖται. θε̣-
α̣c̣ά̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ο̣c̣ δὲ τὸν 'Ορέcτην καὶ χρο-
ὸc cημα]ντῆραc ἀνενέγκαc
διεcά[φει π]ρ̣ὸc τὴν 'Ηλέ̣κ̣[τραν
τ̣[ ]ν. ὁ̣ δ' οὐκ ἔμελ̣[λεν
ἀ]λλ' ὡμολόγηcεν . [
] . . . . . ωνα̣[
] . . . το̣[
] . . . . [
]ον̣τ̣[
] . υλα̣ . [
]ειcδυ[
]ιν τουτ̣[
] . ειντ̣[
. . . .

1 before τ̣ο̣υ̣c̣ only vague traces || 3-4 [φι- | λοτ̣ί̣μων Barrett suits the traces better than αλλ α̣[λ- | λοτρ̣ιων ed. pr. or ὁ- | λοτε̣[λ]ῶν Luppe || 5-6 τ[ο ε- | ρ̣γ[ο]ν̣ ed. pr. : τ[ὴν | χρεί]α̣ν Luppe (χ̣ρ̣ε̣ί̣α̣ν̣ Basta Donzelli), but the first traces do not agree with χρ || 7 [. .] . . θρ̣εψαc ed. pr. : ὑπεκκλέψαc Parmentier (ed. Budé) || 8-9 ε̣[, perhaps ι̣[, cf. μι- | c̣[θιο]ι̣[c] η ed. pr. : μέ̣- | ν̣[ουcι]ν̣ ἡ Luppe || 10-11 χρο- | νίουc suppl. Luppe | -εγ'καc || 12 διεcά[φηcε Luppe || 13 τὸν 'Ορέcτη]ν ed. pr. : τὸν ἀδελφό]ν̣ Diggle OCT : τ̣[ὴν ἀλήθεια]ν Luppe | ἐμέλ̣[λ]ηcε(ν) Luppe || 14 α̣[ed. pr. || 15]υ̣c̣ α̣ρ̣[.]ωνα̣[ed. pr. :

κ]ο̣ῦ̣ϲ̣α̣ν̣ ὧν α̣[Luppe : I discern a high dot prob. followed by χο̣ν̣τ̣ων α̣[|| 16 second letter is ϵ, c or ω || 17]ι̣μ̣α̣[ed. pr. || 19]υμα̣[ed. pr. : perhaps a form of]Π̣υλαδ̣[ηϲ ? || 22] . , γ or τ

7 *P.Mich.* inv. 6222A ?, II-III

ed. pr. G.W. Schwendner, *Literary and Non-literary Papyri from the University of Michigan Collection*, Diss. 1988, 24-29 (unpublished)
re-ed. by W. Luppe, Die Hypothesis zum ersten 'Hippolytos' (P.Mich.inv. 6222A), *ZPE* 102, 1994, 23-39 + pl. Ia
* text based on re-ed. but order of fragments changed, cf. comm.

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Hippolytus* I

Fr. 1 (= Fr. A Luppe)

. . . .
]νεπεϲ . [
]υϲαδελο[
ἐ]ζήτηϲε[
]ν τυχεῖν οὐκ η[
]ε̣μφανη[
]θειν απο[
]Θετταλι[α
] . . ιονεν[
]κ̣ετων κ[
]λαμοιϲ[
]ενχαρ[
. . . . .

1]νεγεϲο[ed. pr. || 2] . c αδ̣ελφ[ed. pr. || 4]ν \τυχεῖν/ | ο corr. from α? || 7]θε παλι . [ed. pr. || 8 Luppe writes] . α̣ in the text, but in the margin "od.] . λ̣" :]αμονεν[ed. pr. || 9 οἰ]κ̣ετῶν ed. pr.

Fr. 2 (= Fr. C Luppe)

. . . .
] . καὶ ταϲ̣[
]παρθενων̣[
]ον καὶ βοη[
Τρ]ο̣ι̣ζῆν̣α̣ [γ]ενομ[ε
]ὁ Θηϲεὺϲ π̣ι̣ϲ̣τ̣[εύ-
ϲαϲ] . [. .]κ̣ατὰ τοῦ παιδ[ὸϲ

]ωνι καὶ μετ' οὐ πολύ̣[
κα]ταξιώcαc αὐτὸc̣ μ[
τὸ]ν ἀcεβήcαντα τω[
]τῶν δ' Ἱππολύτου δούλων εν̣[
ι]π̣που̣[.] . . . [. .]υ̣ . [.]ο̣c̣[
] . τοc . [
ἐκέ]λευc . [
]ρ̣ιτ̣[
] . τ . [

. . . .

13 ν̣[ed. pr. : . [Luppe || 15 Τρο]ιζη[να ed. pr. || 16 π̣ι̣c̣τ̣ : . π . [ed. pr. || 18]ονι ed. pr. || 19 αυτο̣ν̣ μ[ed. pr. || 21 \των διππο/λυ- || 22 ι]π̣πο . [. .]υ̣[. .]ο̣c̣[ed. pr. || 23]ιτοc λ̣[ed. pr. || 26] . τη[ed. pr.

Fr. 3 (= Fr. B Luppe)

. . . . . .

]α[
] . ιζων [ ] . [] . [
Ἱπ]π̣ολύτου cτολὴν̣[
]κ̣ιαν ἐκέλευcε[ν
κα]λυψάμενον το . [
] . τιαc καθίcαι λη[
]c ἀληθῆ τῶν π[
ἔλ]εγχον. γενομε[
]η μὲν Φαίδρα[
]ν̣ ἐζη-
]απων
]νεα του
] . εcθαι
μ]ετανο-
] . να . α

. . . . . .

31 το [ed. pr. || 32] . \τ/ιαc :]\τ/ιαc και̣ ε̣ιc αιλη\ι/[ed. pr. || 36]ν̣ :] . ed. pr.

The lines of fragments 3a, 3b and 4 are not numbered

Fr. 3a . . .	Fr. 3b . . .	Fr. 4 . . .
]δε . [	] . [	] . α . [
. . .	] . οcκ̣[	] . εν . [
	]υ̣cπλ[	]α̣ι̣ του̣[
. [, θ̣[or ε̣[	]ν̣η[	. . .
	. . .	

8 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 2, 44 ?, I

ed. pr. M. Vandoni, *Papiri della Università degli Studi di Milano* 2, Milan 1961, 29-31
cf. Pack 398; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 127, 1983, 155-162 incl. pl.; ed. OCT Diggle (1984: 204-205)

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Hippolytus* II

Col. I

] . ει
]
]
Ἱππόλυτος β, οὗ ἀρχή· πολλὴ μὲν] ἐν
βροτοῖϲι κοὐκ ἀνώνυμοϲ. ἡ δ(ὲ) ὑ]πόθε-
ϲιϲ· Θηϲεὺϲ υἱὸϲ μὲν ἦν Ποϲειδῶνο]ϲ, βα-
ϲιλεὺϲ δ(ὲ) Ἀθηναίων· γήμαϲ δὲ] μ̣ίαν
τῶν Ἀμαζονίδων Ἱππολύτην] Ἱ̣ππό-
λυτον ἐγέννηϲε, κάλλει τε κ]α̣ὶ ϲω-
φροϲύνῃ διαφέροντα. ἐπεὶ δ(ὲ)] ἡ ϲυν-
οικοῦϲα τὸν βίον μετήλλα]ξεν,
ἐπειϲηγάγετο γυναῖκα τὴν] Μίνω
τοῦ Κρητῶν βαϲιλέωϲ θυγατέρα] Φαίδραν.
ὁ δὲ Θηϲεὺϲ Πάλλαντα ἕνα τῶν ϲ]υγγενῶν
φονεύϲαϲ (ἀπ)ῆλθε φυγὰϲ εἰϲ Τ]ρ̣οιζῆνα
μετὰ τῆϲ γυναικόϲ, οὗ ϲυνέβαιν]εν
τὸν Ἱππό]λ̣υτον
]αι

4-6 beginning, suppl. adopted from Luppe; other suppl. are derived from Diggle || 4 εμ || 6 Ποϲειδῶνο]ϲ Luppe : Αἴθραϲ καὶ Ποϲειδῶνοϲ most codd. || 12 Κρητικὴν γυν- codd. || 13 βαϲιλέωϲ καὶ Παϲιφάηϲ θυγ- codd. || 15 (ἀπ)ῆλθε φυγὰϲ Luppe : φεύγει codd. || 18 παρὰ Πιτθεῖ τρέφεϲθ]αι ed. pr.

Col. II

θεαϲ[αμένη δὲ τὸν νεανίϲκον
ἡ Φα[ίδρα εἰϲ ἐπιθυμίαν ὤλιϲθεν,
οὐκ ἀ[κόλαϲτοϲ οὖϲα, πληροῦϲα δ(ὲ) Ἀ-
φροδ[ίτηϲ μῆνιν, ἣ τὸν Ἱππόλυτον
ἀνελ̣[εῖν διὰ τὴν ϲωφροϲύνην ἠ-
θέλη[ϲε. ϲτέργουϲα δὲ
τὴν ν̣[όϲον ἡ Φαίδρα χρόνῳ πρὸϲ

line erased
τὴν [τροφὸν δηλῶcαι ἠναγ-
κάcθ[η, κατεπαγγειλαμένην
αὐτῆ[ι βοηθήcειν. ἥτιc παρὰ τὴν
προα[ίρεcιν (αὐτῆc) λόγουc προc-
ήνε[γκε τῷ νεανίcκῳ. τραχυνό-
μεν[ον δ(ὲ) αὐτὸν ἡ Φαίδρα καταμα-
θοῦ[cα τῇ μὲν τροφῷ ἐπέπλη-
ξεν, [αὐτὴ δὲ ?δι' ἀγχόνηc? μετήλ-
λαξ[ε τὸν βίον. καθ' ὃν καιρὸν
ἐπ[ιφανεὶc Θηcεὺc

23 suppl. Luppe : διὰ cωφροcύνην ἀνελεῖν κρίναcα codd. || 24 θέλη[cε. κρύψαcα δὲ τὸ πρῶτον Luppe || 25 ἡ Φαίδρα om. codd. || 29 αὐτῆc add. Luppe || 33-34 βίον suppl. Luppe : ἑαυτὴν δὲ ἀνήρτηcεν codd. || 35 ἐπ[ιφανεὶc Luppe : φανεὶc codd.

9 *P.IFAO* inv. *P.S.P.* 248 ?, II

ed. pr. M. Papathomopoulos, Un argument sur papyrus de la Médée d'Euripide, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 3, 1964, 37-47 + pl. II
re-ed. by Austin 91 and by Diggle in OCT (1984: 91-92)
cf. Mertens-Pack 454.3; W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 4.1, 1986, 37-58 + pl. III-IV
* text of *hyp. Medea* based on re-ed. Diggle

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Peliades*? and *Medea*

]ετο τὴν Ἰωλκὸν . [
]ποιήcαc· αὐτὸc δὲ τη[

β̄ Μήδεια, ἧc ἀρχ[ή·
Ε]ἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦc μὴ δ[ιαπτάcθαι cκάφοc.
]() τὸν Πελίου φόνον . [
]γενόμενοc ἦλθεν ε[ἰc Κόρινθον Μηδει-
]ạν παραιτηcαμενο[Κρέον-
]ṭοc τοῦ βαcιλεύοντοc [ἡ δὲ Μή-
]δεια βάρβαρον τρόπον[
]ṭα θυμὸν ἐβούλετο τ . [
. .]ων λαβεῖν· ὁ δὲ Κρέ[ων
. .] . η[.] ἐκέλευcε μετὰ [τῶν παίδων
φυ[γάδ]α γενέcθαι . . . [

ἢν αἰτησαμένης . [συνεχώ-
ρησεν· ἡ δ' ἐν̣ταῦθα π[πε-
ρ̣ι̣εγενήθη· τὸν γὰρ π[
Αἰγέα κατὰ τύχην ἐπ[ιφανέντα (ε)αυ-
τὴν ὑποδέξασθαι [
ὑποκριθεῖσα π̣ρὸ̣[ς κο-
μίζοντας δῶρα τῆι [Γλαύκῃ χρυ-
σοῦν στέφανον, οἵ[ς
μετὰ ἀν̣ί̣ας ἀπέλιπ[ε
ἀπέδ̣ρ̣[υ]ψεν· ὁ δὲ π[ατὴρ βο-
ηθεῖν δὲ τῆ̣ι̣ θυγατρὶ [αὐ-
τ̣ῆς ἀ̣π̣οσ̣π̣ά̣σαι τ̣ὰ . . [
. . . εκρ̣ . . . [. .] . . . [
π̣ε̣ . ρ̣α̣ . . . . [. .]ε . . . [

4 ἡ δ' ὑπόθεσις· added in ed. pr. and Diggle, but the line may get too long with these words; cf. ed. pr., the critical notes in Diggle, and Luppe for many possible supplements || 7 παραιτησάμενο[ς Diggle : παρα̣ιτησαμένο[υ Luppe || 19 -θεισα⟦ν⟧ π̣ρο̣[

10 *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 25, 2 ?, I-II

ed. pr. R.W. Daniel, in *Papyri, Ostraca, Parchments and Waxed tablets in the Leiden Papyrological Institute* (*Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 25), (ed. F.A.J. Hoogendijk-P. van Minnen), Leiden 1991, 3-4 + pl. I
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 89, 1991, 15-17
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Melanippe Sophe*

θηλαζόμε]νοι δὲ ὑπὸ μιᾶς τ[ῶν βοῶν
] τ̣έρατα τῷ βασιλεῖ π[ροσήνεγκαν· ὁ δὲ τῇ τοῦ
πατρὸς Ἕλ]ληνος γνώμῃ [πεισθεὶς ὁλοκαυτοῦν τὰ
βρέφη] . α̣ς Μελανίππῃ τῇ̣[θυγατρὶ προσέταξεν
ἐνταφίοις αὐτὰ κοσμῆσα]ι̣· ἡ δὲ κ[αὶ τὸν κόσμον κτλ.

. . . .

4 κρί]ν̣α̣ς ed. pr., but I discern only two dots before α̣ς || 5 the tops of letters agree with]ιηδεκ[(of ι only one high dot; cf. already Luppe 17:]ηδ̣ε̣κ̣[) not with]ῆ̣ς̣α̣ι̣[ed. pr.

11 *P.Amst.* 1, 7 ?, III

ed. pr. P.J. Sijpesteijn, The Rejuvenation Cure of Pelias, *ZPE* 9, 1972, 104-110
re-ed. by R.P. Salomons-P.J. Sijpesteijn-K.A. Worp, *Die Amsterdamer Papyri* 1, Zutphen 1980, 16-17 + pl. IV
* inspexi; text based on re-ed.

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Peliades*

Col. I

]ων
]θρουϲ
]γὰρ
] . τυ
]ϲ̣αι
]μ̣ε
] . α
]τ̣
]ν
]
] .
] .
]τε
]ουϲ
]ω
] . . ν
] . η
] . . ι
]ι
]
]
] .
]
] .

Col. II

Πελίου μ[
τὴν ἧξιν̣[
μεν ἀπο[
ϲεν τὴν δ̣[
ϲιν διὰ ο̣[
χην τῆϲ ο̣[
βον εἰϲ ετ̣[
ϲάντων ε[
ὅτι τὸν γε̣[
ον εἰϲ γερ . [
παρ' αὐτῇ α̣[
τὸ ῥηθὲν̣[
κριὸν ϲ̣ι̣[
νέον ἐπ[
θεαϲαμ̣ε[
τηϲ γέρων [
λαβεῖν ἐν[
πεῖραν το̣[Πελει-
άδων επα̣[
τ̣ὴν δοχμ̣[
. . οϲ οἰκε̣[
ἑαυτὸν[
τον . [
δαξα[
θοντα[
μενο[
κ̣αὶ τῆϲ [κα-
θεψήϲαϲα[Πε-
λειάδεϲ δι̣[πα-
τρὸϲ ἀναιρε̣[
θοντα δευ̣[
θυγατέρεϲ [λε-
βῆτα κ̣ελ̣[

37 κρειον

12 *PSI* 12, 1286 ?, II

ed. pr. C. Gallavotti, *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 61, 1933, 177-188
re-ed. by V. Bartoletti, *Papiri greci e latini* 12, Firenze 1951, 191-196 and by Austin 92, 95-96 (only col. II)
cf. Mertens-Pack 454.4 (Pack 428); W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 2, 1982, 74-82 + pl. IX and 265-271 + pl. I
* text based on re-edition Bartoletti, but suppl. to *Rh.* according to OCT Diggle (1994: 429-430)

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Rhesus, Rhadamanthys, Scyrii*

Fr. A col. I

τὸν γὰρ ἐκ τούτο]ṿ κίν-
δυνον ἔcεcθαι μείζονα τοῖc] Ἕλλη-
cιν, ἐὰν βιώcῃ̣. τούτοι]c δ' ἐπι-
φανεὶc μὲν ὁ Ἀλέξανδροc] ἐπῃ̣cθη-
μένοc τὴν πολεμίων παρ]ουcίαν,
ἐξαπατηθεὶc δ'] ὑπὸ τῆc Ἀθηνᾶc
ὡc Ἀφροδίτ]ηc ἄπρακτοc ἐπέcτρε-
ψεν. οἱ δὲ πε]ρ̣ὶ̣ τὸν Διομήδην φο-
νεύcαντεc Ῥ]ῆcον ἐπειγομένωc
ἐχωρίcθηcα]ν. ἡ cυμφορὰ δὲ τῶν
ἀνῃρημέν̣ων καθ' ὅλον ἐ̣λαλήθη
τ̣ὸ̣ cτράτε̣[υμ]α̣. παραγενηθέ[ντοc
δὲ Ἕκτοροc̣ [ἵ]να αὐτόπτηc̣ τ̣[ῶν
πεπραγμέ̣[ν]ων γένηται τετ[ρ]ω̣-
μένοc ὁ τῶ̣[ν Ῥή]cου πώλων ἐ[πιμ]ε-
λητὴc διὰ τ̣[οῦ Ἕκ]τοροc τὸν φ[όνο]ν
ἐνηργῆcθα[ι ἐ]πινοεῖ. τ̣ο̣ύ̣του̣ δ' ἀ-
π̣ολογουμέ[ν]ου τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐ-
τ̣οῖc ἐμήνυ[cε(ν) ἡ] Κ̣αλλιόπη νεκρὸν
κομίζουc̣[α το]ῦ̣ Ῥήc̣ου τὸ cῶμα.
κατοδ[υρομένη δ]ὲ̣ καὶ τὸν ἐπιπ[λα-
κέν]τ̣[α αὐτῇ C]τ̣ρυμόνα διὰ τὸ [τοῦ
παιδὸc πένθ]οc καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἐκε̣[ίνου
γεγενημέν]ον Ῥῆcον οὐδ' Ἀχ[ιλλέα
ἔφηcεν ἀδάκ]ρ̣υτον ἔcεcθαι.
Ῥαδάμανθυc, οὗ ἀρχή]·

. . . .

3 cι ἐὰν εἰc αὔριον βιῶι Luppe || 16 δι' αὐ[τοῦ re-ed. : διὰ τ̣[οῦ Luppe (this reading has been confirmed by I. Andorlini who checked the original) || 17]π̣ινοει˙ : l. ἐ]πενόει? Haslam (private note) || 20 -μα˙ || 25 ἔφηcεν Luppe : φηcὶν codd.

Fr. A col. II

]λ̣υδεύκους, ἀνηρέθη μονομαχήcας.
ʽΡ]αδαμάνθυος δ' ἐπὶ μὲν τῆι νίκηι̣ [χ]α̣ί̣-
ρ]οντος, ἐπὶ δὲ ταῖc θυγατράcιν ἀ[λ-
γ]οῦντος Ἄρτεμιc ἐπιφανεῖcα πρ̣[οc-
έταξε τὴν μὲν ʽΕλένην ἀ[μφοτέροιc
τοῖc ἀδελφοῖc τοῖc τεθν[ηκόcι τὰc
τιμὰc καταcτήcαcθαι, [τὰc θυγα-
τέραc δ' αὐτοῦ θεὰc ἔφη γεν̣[έcθαι.
Cκύριοι, ὧν ἀρχή˙
Ὦ Τυνδαρεία παῖ Λάκαινα[
ἡ δ' ὑπόθεcιc˙
Θέτιδοc τοῦ παιδὸc ʼΑχιλλέω̣[c τὴν εἱμαρ-
μένην ἐπεγ̣ν̣ωκυίαc, τῆ̣[c ἐπὶ τὴν Ἴλι-
ον cτρατείαc αὐτ̣ὸ̣ν̣ ἀ̣[πείργειν θέ-
λουcα κόρηc ἐcθῆτ̣[ι κρύψαcα παρέθε-
το Λυκομήδει τῶι Cκυρίω[ν δυνά-
cτηι. τρέφων δ' ἐκεῖνο[c θυγατέρα
μητρὸc ὀρφανὴν ὄνομα̣ [Δηδάμει-
αν, ταύτηι cυνεπαρθένευε̣[ν αὐτὸν ἀ-
γνο[ούμ]ενον ὅc ἐcτιν˙ ὁ δ[ὲ λαθραῖ-
οc [ὑπο]κλέψαc τὴν Δηιδά[μειαν ἔγ-
κυ[ον ἐπ]οίηcεν. οἱ δὲ περὶ τ̣[ὸν ʼΑγαμέ-
μνον̣[α χ]ρ̣ηcμῶν αὐτοὺc κ̣[ελευόν-
των χ[ωρ]ὶc ʼΑχιλλέωc μὴ π[οιεῖcθαι
τὴν cτ̣[ρα]τεί[α]ν ̣ [ ] ̣ ̣ [
Διομή[δ] κ̣αι ν̣[
καταν[ο]ήcαν[τεc

. . . .

27 Πο- |]λυβευ- | ανειρεθη || 28 νεικηι̣ || 31 εταξε˙ | [ηκόcι τὰc or perhaps [ηκόcιν Diggle (1989: 6 n. 27) || 32 τειμαc || 35 αρχη˙ || 37 -cιc˙ || 38 αχιλεω̣[|| 39 ἐπὶ τὴν Ἴλι- re-ed. : πρὸc Ἴλι- Luppe || 40-41 suppl. Luppe : ἀ[πεῖργε περιβα- | ̣ ̣ ̣ [α καὶ παρέθε- re-ed. || 43 δηκεινο[|| 46 εcτιν˙ || 48 -cεν˙ || 50 αχιλεωc || 51 ̣ [ ] ̣ ̣ [: according to I. Andorlini ἐ̣[πέc]τ̣ε̣[ιλαν τὸν] re-ed. is better compatible with the traces than Luppe's τ̣[ὸν ʼΟδυ]c̣c̣[έα cὺν]

Fr. B

. . . .

]. ηντε̣[
]ωνοϲιερ̣[
]δικτ̣υ̣ο̣ϲ[
]. . . ετ̣ι . [
]ι̣δ . α̣ν̣ειλ[
]. . . [

. . . .

55 ed. pr. suggests Ἀπόλλ]ωνοϲ ἱερ[

13 *P.Mich.* inv. 1319 (*Pap.Lugd.Bat.* 17, 18) ?, III-IV

ed. pr. E.G. Turner, *Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 17, Leiden 1968, 133-136 + pll. XII, XIII
identified by M.A. Harder, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 7-14
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 27, 1977, 89-99; —, *Philologus* 122, 1978, 6-13 incl. pl.; —, *Eos* 75, 1987, 251-256; —, *ZPE* 89, 1991, 18; J.S. Rusten, *ZPE* 40, 1980, 39-42; Cribiore (1996: no. 301)
* since this text was written twice by different schoolhands with many errors (cf. comm.), I print the reconstructed exemplar as in Harder (1979: 8). See the ed. pr. for a proper edition.

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Temenidae*

οὗτοι μὲν οὖν βιαϲάμενοι τὸν πατέρα τοῖϲ Ἡρακλέουϲ παιϲὶν ϲυγκατελοχίϲθηϲαν. ⟨ἀν⟩αβιβαϲάμενοι δὲ τὸ τῶν Πελοποννηϲίων ϲτράτευμα ἐπ' αὐτοὺϲ διεβίβαϲαν, ὧν Ὀρέϲτου παῖϲ ⟨Τιϲαμενόϲ⟩. Τήμενοϲ ⟨δὲ⟩ ὁ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν πρεϲβύτατοϲ ἐκτά⟨τ⟩των τὸ ϲτράτευμα τὴν βαϲιλείαν ἔφηϲεν παραδώϲειν τῶι εἰϲ τὴν μάχην ἀριϲτεύϲαντι τῶν υἱῶν. τὸ μὲν οὖν κρῖμα τῆϲ μάχηϲ ἐγένετο κατὰ τοὺϲ Ἡρακλείδαϲ, ἄριϲτοϲ δὲ ἐκρίνετο Ἀρχέλαοϲ ὁ πρεϲβύτατοϲ . . . . . . *Τημενιδῶν* (?) . . . . . .

14 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3652 Oxyrhynchus, III

ed. pr. H.M. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52, London 1984, 22-26 + pl. I
cf. Mertens-Pack 454.2; W. Luppe, *APF* 32, 1986, 5-13
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Hypsipyle, Phrixus I*

Col. I	Col. II
	. . . .] . . [
	surface stripped
	. . . . . .] . νελ[
	. . . .]τὴν μ[ητέρα
	ρ . [.]τοῖϲ . . [
	τὴν μητέρα . [
	ευρον αν . . τη[
	θαυ . . . . αυτ[
	.] . ηϲαν . υρ[
	. .]ϲθη . [.]ν ϲ . [
	. .]να γὰρ . ϊ[
	.]αντοϲ α[
	Ἀρ]χεμορ[
	τὸ]ν παῖδ[α
	.]υ τῶν πάντ[ων
	Φρ[ίξοϲ πρῶτοϲ, οὗ ἀρχή·
	εἰ] μὲν τόδ' ἦμ[αρ πρῶτον ἦν κακουμένῳ.
	Ἀθάμαϲ υἱὸϲ μ[ὲν ἦν Αἰόλου, βαϲιλεὺϲ δὲ
]ναρ · · [.] ·	Θετταλῶν, ε[ἶχε δὲ παῖδαϲ ἐκ Νεφέληϲ Ἕλλην καὶ
]ελυ^θειϲα^	Φρίξον· ἔτι δὲ [Ἰνοῖ τῇ
]φεν	Κάδμου παιδὶ[
]α].[. . .]α	τὰ τῶν προγόν[ων ἐμηχανή-
] . η	ϲατο καθάπερ [φο τὸν τῆϲ μη-
]τα	τρυιᾶϲ πικρὸν . [ϲυγκα-
]ξαυ	λέϲαϲα γὰρ τῶν [Θετταλῶν γυναῖκαϲ ὅρ-
] . . ι	κοιϲ κατηϲφαλ[ίϲατο φρύγειν ϲπέρμα πύρι-
]ελυ	νον ἐπὶ τὴν χε[ιμερινὴν ϲπορὰν
]υ	ἀκαρπίαϲ[
] .	λυϲιν εἰ Φρίξοϲ [ϲφαγείη Διὶ
]ου	εἰϲ Δελφοὺϲ ἀπ[ἄγγε-
	λον ἔπειϲε ὡϲ . [

col. i 29] ̣ :]ν̣ (ed. pr.) impossible for this trace is written differently. It might be a kind of mark, perhaps to call attention to something in col. ii
col. ii 11 ϊ̣[|| 17 the citation may be followed by *ἡ δ' ὑπόθεϲιϲ·* || 19 *ἔ*[*χων* ed. pr. : ϵ[*ἶχϵ δὲ* cf. Luppe 7; see also **16** fr. 14.3 for more possible supplements || 20 *φρίξον* | [*καὶ ϲυνῴκηϲεν* ed. pr, but cf. **16** fr. 14.3, 9-10 || 24 *τρυϊαϲ* || 28 *ακαρπιαϲ* ⟦*αγει̣̣* [

15 *P.Oxy.* 31, 2544 Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. J.W.B. Barns-R.A. Coles, Fragments from Oxyrhynchus, *CQ* ns 15, 1965, 52-55
re-ed. by J.W.B. Barns, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 31, London 1966, 54-55
cf. Mertens-Pack 426.1; W.S. Barrett, *CQ* 59, 1965, 58-71; ed. OCT Diggle (1994: 75-77)
* inspexi; text based on re-ed.

Contents: *hyp.* to E. *Phoenissae*

Frr. 1 and 2

'Ε]τ̣εοκλῆϲ π̣[αραλαβ]ὼ̣ν τὴν ἐν Θ̣ή[βαιϲ βαϲιλείαν
τ]ὸ̣ν ἀδελφ[ὸν Πολυ]ν̣είκην ἀπ̣[εϲτέρηϲε τοῦ δι-
κ]α̣ί̣ου· φυγὰ[ϲ δ' εἰϲ Ἄρ]γοϲ παραγε[νόμενοϲ ἐκεῖ-
νο]ϲ̣ ἔγημεν̣ [θυγατέ]ρ̣α τ̣[οῦ] β̣α̣ϲ̣ι̣[λέωϲ Ἀδρά-
ϲτ]ου· κ[α]τε̣[λθεῖν δ' εἰϲ τὴν πατρίδα φιλοτιμού-
μ]ενο̣[ϲ] κ̣[αὶ τὸν πενθερὸν πείϲαϲ ϲτρατ ?
ονιδων ϲυ̣[νήθροιϲεν ἐπὶ Θήβαϲ· ἡ δὲ μήτηρ αὐ-
τῶν ἔπειϲ̣ε̣[ν αὐτὸν ὑπόϲπονδον εἰϲ τὴν πόλιν
π̣αραγενέϲθα̣[ι. δεινοπροϲωπήϲαντοϲ δὲ ὑπὲρ
τ]ῆϲ̣ τυραννίδ[οϲ Ἐτεοκλέουϲ οὐκ ἠδύνατο τὰ
τέ]κνα ϲυναγα̣γ[εῖν εἰϲ φιλίαν· Πολυνείκηϲ δὲ
πα]ρ̣αταξόμεν[οϲ ἐχωρίϲθη. Τειρεϲίαϲ δ' ἔχρη-
ϲεν το]ὺϲ ἐκ τῆϲ [πόλεωϲ νικήϲειν ἐὰν ὁ Κρέον-
τοϲ υἱὸ]ϲ̣ Μ̣[ενοικεὺϲ, κτλ.

. . . .

16 *P.Oxy.* 27, 2455 + *P.Stras.* gr. 2676 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. E.G. Turner, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 27, London 1962, 32-69 + pll. IV, VI, IX; cf. Pack 453

* inspexi (not *P.Stras.* gr. 2676); the following information is given at the top of each fragment:
- Turner's numeration of lines between brackets. In view of the uncertain position of many fragments, the lines are not numbered continuously.
- titles of the relevant plays.
- short bibliographical references to the most important literature which is primarily concerned with the constitution of the text. When more than one fragment belongs to the same play, these references are only mentioned before the first fragment.

Only existing lines are supplemented (according to the parallel version when they seem to agree with it), whereas the first edition gives a more complete picture because it adds headings etc.

Contents: *hypp.* to E. *Medea, Melanippe Sophe, Oedipus, Orestes, Peliades, Sciron, Stheneboea, Syleus, Telephus, Temenidae, Temenus, Tennes, Troades, Hypsipyle, Phaëthon, Philoctetes, Phoenissae, Phoenix, Phrixus I + II, Chrysippus*, and more unidentified fragments

Fr. 1 (Turner 1-7) *Medea?, Melanippe Sophe?*
re-ed. by Austin 92 and 90

]α̣μενη δ[
] ̣ ρ̣ειαν˙ τ̣[
ϲ̣εν˙ αυτη[
<u>πτερωτ</u>ον[
Με[
Ζεὺϲ δ ̣ [
. . . . .

2] ̣ , lower part of oblique, perhaps α, η, κ | -αν˙ || 3 ϲ̣εν˙ || 6 ̣ [, upper left part of curve, e.g. ϵ, ο, ρ, ω

Fr. 2 (Turner 8-23) *Melanippe Sophe*
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 73, 1988, 30

. . . .

ἐ]κ μὲν Ε[ὐ]ρυ̣[δίκηϲ ἐγέννηϲε Κρηθέα καὶ
Ϲ]α̣λμωνέα κ̣[αὶ Ϲίϲυφον˙ ἐκ δὲ τῆϲ Χείρω-
ν̣οϲ θυγατρὸ[ϲ Ἵππηϲ κάλλει διαφέρου-
ϲ̣αν Μελανίππ[ην. αὐτὸϲ μὲν οὖν φόνον
π̣[οιήϲαϲ ἐ]π' ἐνια̣[υτὸν ἀπῆλθε φυγάϲ˙
τ̣ὴν δ̣ὲ̣ Με̣[λ]αν[ίππην Ποϲειδῶν διδύμων
παίδων ἔγκυ[ον] ἐποίηϲ̣[εν. ἡ δὲ διὰ τὴν προϲ-

δοκίαν τῆς το[ῦ] πατρὸς [παρουσίας τοὺς γεν-
νηθέντας [εἰ]ς τὴν βουσ̣[τασιν ἔδωκε τῇ
τροφῶι θε̣[ῖν]α̣ι κατὰ τὴ[ν ἐντολὴν τοῦ κα-
τ̣ασπείρα̣[ντ]ο̣ς· ὑπὸ δὲ̣ [τὴν κάθοδον τοῦ
δ̣υνάστο̣[υ τὰ] βρέφη τιν̣[ὲς τῶν βουκόλων
φυλαττ̣[όμεν]α μὲν ὑ̣[πὸ τοῦ ταύρου, θη-
λα]ζ̣ό̣μ̣[ενα δ]ὲ̣ ὑπ[ὸ μιᾶς τῶν βοῶν ἰδόντες
ὡς β]ο[υγεν]ῆ τ̣[έρατα

. . . .

1ff. supplements as in Turner, cf. the parallel text of the *hyp.* in Johannes Logothetes (ed. Rabe, *RhM* 63, 1908, 145; reprinted in Collard-Cropp-Lee 1995: 248) and Gregorius Cor. (ed. Nauck 509) || 2 C]αλαμω- : Cα̣λαμω- ed. pr., but there is only a trace of a round letter on a separate scrap which does not seem to belong here in view of the following line beginnings || 7 *ενκυ-* || 10]*αι᾽κατα* || 11 *τ̣ασσπειρα̣[ντ]ο̣ς᾽* || 12 *βρεφηι* || 13 ὑ̣[|| 14 ὑπ[

Fr. 3 (Turner 24-31)
col. I: cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 90, 1992, 48-49

. . .

]. [
] . . ελ
]ς̣

. . .

2] . . :]α̣δ̣ Turner, but instead of *αδ* I discern a small vertical trace and a short curved horizontal which is more similar to the bottom of a round letter than to that of *δ*; Luppe's suggestion (1992) that this column preserves text of the *Oeneus hyp.* is primarily based on the reading]α̣δ̣ελ- which appears to be uncertain

col. II *Orestes* (suppl. as in OCT Diggle (1994: 186-187)

. . . .

ο[ὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δεινὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος
[ἡ δ᾽ ὑπόθεσις]
᾽Ορέστ[ης τὸν φόνον τοῦ πατρὸς μετα-
πορευόμ̣[ενος ἀνεῖλεν Αἴγισθον καὶ
Κλυτ[αιμ(ν)ήστραν· μητροκτονῆσαι δὲ
τολμ̣ή̣[σας παραχρῆμα τὴν δίκην ἔδω-
. . .] . [

. . . .

fr. 113 *Orestes*
cf. W.S. Barrett, *CQ* n.s. 15, 1965, 67-68

. . . .

ἔδωκεν εἰc χεῖραc α]ὐτοῖc· οἱ δὲ ταύ-
την φονεύειν ἔμελ]λον· ἐπιφα[νε]ὶ[c
δὲ Μενέλαοc καὶ βλέπων] ἑ[α]υτὸν [ἅμα

. . . .

1 -c˙

fr. 4 (Turner 32-42) + fr. 141 *Orestes Oedipus*
cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *Gnomon* 35, 1963, 439-443; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 60, 1985, esp. 16-20 + pl. Ib; —, *ZPE* 65, 1986, 29-30; J. Diggle, *ZPE* 77, 1989, 1-11 = *Euripidea*, Oxford 1994, 327-340

. . . .

πορθεῖ]ν· οἱ δὲ [φθάcαντεc . . . .] . . [
κατηπ]ε̣ίληcαν· ἐπ̣[ιφανεὶc] δ' Ἀπόλλ[ων
Ἑλένην] μὲν αὐτὸc [ἔφηcεν] ε̣[ἰc] θ[ε]οὺ[c
διακο]μίζειν· Ὀρέ[cτῃ δὲ] ἐπέταξε̣[ν
αὐτ]ῷ μὲν Ἑρμιόνη[ν λαβεῖ]ν γυνα̣[ῖκα
Πυλ]άδῃ δὲ Ἠλέκτρα[ν cυνοικί]cαι[
καθα]ρθέντι δὲ τὸν [τῆc μητρὸc φόνον
Ἄρ]γουc δυναcτεύε̣[ιν.
Ο]ἰ δ ί π ο υ c, [οὗ ἀρχή·
Φοῖ]βον ποτ . . . [ἐῶντοc ἔcπειρεν
]τέκν[ο]ν. ἡ [δ' ὑπόθεcιc·

. . . .

1] . . [, first ι or ρ (Luppe 1986 reads]ρη[]); then, small arc which prob. does not agree with the codd. reading ὑφάψε]ιν[|| 2 ἠπείληcαν codd. : κατηπ- Diggle (1989: 2) | -cαν· || 4 -ζειν· | ἐπέταξε̣[ν Diggle, codd. suits the traces better than ἐπετειλ[εν Luppe (1985) || 5 αὐτ]ῷ Lloyd-Jonec; the ω agrees with the low curve || 10 after ποτ appear the following traces: part of an oblique plus upright; small horizontal at top plus curved tail, perhaps ρ?; two oblique traces at top, perhaps υ; traces which resemble right part of κ

Fr. 18
cf. W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 3, 1983, 125-142 + pl. 1

Col. I *Oedipus* ?	Col. II *Peliades* ?
. . .	. . . .
]c	. . .]ανοπ[

]ṿεπ[. .] .
]θελων
]υθηι
] . ι̣ γήρωc
] . [ ] .
]
. . .

τοc αὐτοῦ κρ[
] . ωc τὴν ἐλπ[
ε]ἰ̣c̣κομιζουcα . [
. . .]cτατην ε[.] . α̣[
.]ω̣cαμένηι καὶ το[παρά-
δοξον ὡc ἐcτιν δυ̣[
μαcιν δείξαcα· κρ[
ἤδη λα[βο]ῦc̣α καταμ̣[
κα[. . . .]ε̣ν̣ειc . [.]β . [
] . . α̣· νεc[
. . . .

5] . two uprights || 9] . , oblique: *κ* or *χ*? || 10 *εκκομ-* Turner | . [upright || 11] . , low dot || 14 *δειξαcαcα* Turner; -*cα*· || 16 a separate fragment,]*ηκ*[, has been placed before]ε̣ν̣ | c . [, λ or *μ*; λ agrees with Luppe's *εἰc* λ̣[έ]*βη*[*τα* (*β* is followed by upright) || 17 -*α*·

Fr. 5 (Turner 43-64) ?, *Stheneboea*
cf. pl. VI ed. pr.
On 1-6: re-ed. by Austin 94; cf. W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 4.2, 1986, 223-243 + pl. 13
on *Sthen.*: cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Cl.Ph.* 3, 1908, 225-232; J. Schwartz, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 44; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 49, 1982, 19-20; —, *ZPE* 55, 1984, 7-8 + pl. Ia; —, *Wiss. Zeitsch. Univ. Halle* 34, 1985, 99-102; —, *ZPE* 75, 1988, 49-50

. . . .
]υc κ̣ερ[
ἐ]π̣ιφαṿ[εὶ]c δ' Ἡ̣ρα[κλῆc?
]ενοc ὑπ̣[ὸ] τοῦ cυ̣[
] . λαβών· καὶ . . . [
] . . .()ṿ αὐτοῦ̣ κα[ὶ] τη[
]θηι ——
Ϲ̣ θ̣ ε] ṿ [έ] β ο ι α, ἧc ἀρχή·
οὐκ ἔcτιν, ὅc]τιc πάντ' ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμο̣[νεῖ.
ἡ δ'] ὑ̣πόθεcιc·
Π̣ροῖ[τ]ο̣[c Ἄβαν]τοc μὲν ἦν υἱόc̣, [Ἀκριcίου
δὲ ἀδε̣[λφόc,] β̣α̣cιλεὺc δὲ Τί̣ρ[υνθοc.
Cθεν̣[έβοιαν δὲ] γήμαc ἐξ αὐτῆ[c ἐγέν-
ν]ηc̣[ε παῖδαc. Βελλεροφόντην δὲ φεύ-
γο̣[ντα ἐκ Κορίνθου διὰ φόνον αὐτὸc μὲν
[ἥγνιcε τοῦ μύcουc, ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν]
ξένον ἠγ]άπ̣[ηcεν. τυχεῖν δὲ οὐ δυναμέ-]

νη τῶν] ἐπιθυ[μημάτων διέβαλεν ὡϲ
ἐπι]θέμενον̣[
] . ˙ πιϲτ[εύϲαϲ δὲ ὁ Προῖτοϲ ἐξέ-
πεμψεν αὐτ]ὸν εἰϲ [Καρίαν
] . [
. . . .

There is no evidence that the three fragments which have been added to the main one belong here (see below frr. 5a-c) || 1 there seems to be no space for a ι between κ and ρ || 3 ὑπ- || 4 -ων˙ | . . . [: πυ̣[ed. pr., but the first letter seems to be a τ followed by a round letter (ο or ε, not α as in Luppe, 1986) and perhaps υ || 5 above η in l. 6 is the foot of a long descender, prob. ρ or φ || 7 αρχηι̣[|| 10-14 text printed bold is *P.Stras.* gr. 2676 Bd (according to Luppe, 1984); 10ff. supplements according to Joh. Logoth. and Greg. Cor. (editions mentioned at fr. 2) || 10]τουμεν || 11 τειρ[|| 14 αὐτὸϲ Wilamowitz 226 : αὐτὸν Joh. || 19] . ˙, upper part of a vertical and a high dot; a small fragment stands before] . ˙ πιϲτ: high dot followed by τ (ed. pr. prints this fragment before]ονειϲ in l. 20) || 20 another small fragment has been placed before ον:] . τ[, in which] . is the lower part of an upright preceded by a small oblique, e.g ν, ω, or . ι

Fr. 5a (part of Turner 43-48) cf. pl. VI ed. pr.

. . . .
] . [
]τ[
. ε . . [
. κ . . . [
ρα[
. [
. . .

1 low horizontal || 3 before ε traces which resemble λ or right part of μ; after ε is an upright with a small trace at the right side of the top; and curved trace, perhaps ε, c or right side of κ || 4 κ is preceded by α (with a stroke through it?) and followed by a roundish corner; then perhaps ρ and υ || 6 top of upright

Fr. 5b (part of Turner 46-48)

. . . .
]υϲ[
] . αλουϲ [
]αϲα . [

2] . , γ or τ? | instead of υ perhaps ϊ || 3 . [, slightly curved vertical || below the last line is an empty space with some traces, maybe part of a paragraphus?

Fr. 5c (part of Turner 50)

. .
]c . [
. .

To the left and before c is a high curved trace, prob. the beginning of a paragraphus; part of high horizontal follows c : scrap placed in ed. pr. at the beginning of the titel *Stheneboea* and deciphered as:]cθ[

Fr. 24 + 95 *Stheneboea*

. . . .
πάλιν δὲ ἐπιςτρέψας εἰς τὴν Τίρ]υν[θα
τ̣ὸ̣[ν μὲν Προῖτον κατεμέμψατο ἀν]έc[ει-
cε δ[ὲ τὴν Cθενέβοιαν ὡς εἰς Καρίαν ἀπά-
ξω̣[ν.
. . . .

3 ὡς εἰς (εἰς add. Wilamowitz 226) τὴν Καρίαν Joh.

Fr. 6a (Turner 65-73) *Stheneboea*

κ]α̣τὰ Μ̣[ῆλον τὴν νῆcον γενόμενος ἐκεί-
νην ἀπέρ . . [ψεν. αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν ἀπο-
θανο̣ῦcαν ἀλ̣[ιεῖς εὑρόντες εἰς Τίρυν-
θα διεκόμιc[αν. πάλιν δὲ ἐπιςτρέψας
ὁ Βελλεροφό[ν]της π̣[ρὸς τὸν Προῖτον αὐ-
τ̣ὸς ὡ̣μολόγ[η]c̣εν π̣[επραχέναι ταῦτα·
δὶς γὰρ ἐπιβουλευθ[εὶς ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων
δίκην̣ εἰληφένα[ι τὴν πρέπουσαν τῆς
μ̣ὲν̣ [ε]ἰ̣c̣ τὸ ζῆν [τοῦ δὲ εἰς τὸ λυπεῖcθαι.
. . . .

2 ἀπερ . . [, last traces are a dot and an upright, prob. the right part of ε plus ι (cf. fr. 6b l. 4 ει) : ἀπέρριψεν Joh. || 3 suppl. Turner : ἁλιεῖς ἀναλαβόντες διεκόμιcαν εἰς τὴν Τίρυνθα Joh. || 6 \ω/μολ̣ηγ[ ]c̣εν || 7 -θ[εὶς, παρ' Luppe 1988

Fr. 6b (Turner 74-90) *Sciron*
re-ed. by Austin 94
cf. W. Luppe, *SCO* 32, 1982, 231-233 (+ 33, 1983 Korrektur Bei-

lage); —, *Anagennesis* 4, 1986, 230 Anm. 4; —, *BACPS* 5, 1988, 97-111; —, *APF* 40.1, 1994, 13-19 + pl. 11

. . . .

Cκείρων̣[οὗ ἀρχή
Ἑρμῆ, cὺ γὰρ δὴ[
ἔχειc· ἡ δ' ὑ̣[πόθεcιc
Cκείρων τῶν κατει̣cτ[
θηι· πετρῶνα καταλαβ̣[ὼν
ἀπὸ λῃcτείαc βίον εἶ̣χ[εν
Ποcειδῶνοc ὤν· καὶ τ̣ . [
τοc ἔγβαcιν οὐ θεωρῶν [
που καὶ διάκονον τῆc ὑ̣β[
ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἐπέτρεψ[εν
ρεῖν· αὐτὸc δὲ ἐχωρίcθ[η.
ἐρημίαν cάτυρ̣οι εἰc . [
ἑταιρῶν θη . [
θηcαν ὑ . οτ[
κειαc ἐχοντ[
μ̣ετ̣ὰ χεῖρα[c
δ[

. . . .

1 [cάτυροι, ὧν ἀρχή Austin, but after Cκείρων one expects [cατυρικὸc οὗ ἀρχή Haslam (private note) || 2 ερμηι || 3 ε̄χειc | ἡ̈ || 5 θηι· || 7 ων· | . [, upright || 8 ἔγβ- (μ corr. to γ) | θεῶ- || 9 ὕβ̣[|| 11 ρειν· | ἔχω- || 12 . [, η, ι or κ? || 13 . [, prob. ρ || 14 ὕλ̣οτ- or (less likely) ὕπ̣οτ-

Fr. 7 (Turner 91-102; cf. frr. 7a-c below) satyrplay?
re-ed. by Austin 93
cf. W. Luppe, *APF* 34, 1988, 15-25 + pl. 15

]ν οὖν cάτυροι κα[
]εουc· Ἑρμῆc δεθη[
]ων ἐπέζευξεν̣[
]φυγὼν δ' ἐ̣ντεῦθε̣[ν
]μαχο̣μ[ε]νοc cὺν . [ ] . ω . . [ἐ-
πι]φανεὶc δὲ τ̣οῖc cατύρ̣οιc πα . [ἐξ-
έπ]ληξεν αὐτούc· ὧν μὲν οἱ . [
] . [] . [ ]ηθηcαν ε[
]τ̣αc ἐμπρῆθ̣[ειν

. . . .

2 -ουϲ˙ | δεθη prob. not corrected in δεϲθη (Turner); on the form of the ϵ, cf. the second and third ϵ in fr. 14.1 l. 5 || 5 μαχαμ- | . [ ] . ω . . [, beginning of oblique (λ, μ or χ); space; low dot; ω; upright; dot || 6 . [, ρ (ed. pr.) seems preferable to ι (Luppe) || 7 -ουϲ˙ | . [, low dot plus slightly descending horizontal || 8] . [] . [, small trace at top of line; space; top of curved letter

Fr. 7a (beginning Turner 91-94)

. .
. [
. [
. [
δẹ[
τọ[
. [
. .

Fr. 7b (beginning Turner 95-102)

. .
η[
. [
ξ[
ν . . [
.()[
. [
[
. [
. .

Fr. 7a 1 upright and curve, perhaps ν? || 2 two dots || 3 part of high horizontal followed by low dot, looks like τ || 6 dot
Fr. 7b 1 θ̣[Turner || 2 part of curve || 4 . . [, round letter and part of upright || 5 ω or one round letter plus dot || 6 small high oblique or part of curve || 8 . [, left part of round letter

Fr. 7c (part of Turner 98-101)
placed in ed. pr. at the end of fr. 7 col. vii; cf. Luppe 1988

. . . . . .
]ẹιναι[
]ϲειν[
]ϲδηϲειν τ̣ω κε[
4] . τουϲ φυγει . [
. . . . . .

4] . , upright with horizontal at top, γ or τ? | . [, upper part of vertical, prob. ν[

P.Stras. gr. 2676 *Syleus*
ed. pr. J. Schwartz, Wartetext 7, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 43-44
fr. Aa identified by H.J. Mette, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 173 + Pl. 9d
cf. W. Luppe, *SIFC* 3.2, 1984, 35-39
* the following text is based on observations of R. Kannicht

. . . .

C υ λ ε ὺ c cατυ]ρ̣ικόc[οὗ ἀρχή·
]ν ὑψ[
ἡ δ' ὑπό]θ̣εcιc·   [
Ἡρακλεῖ φονε]ύcαντι τὸν ἑαυτ[οῦ ξένον
Ἴφιτον τὸν Ε]ὐρύτου· Ζεὺc ἐπ̣[
ἀπ]εμποληθέντι[
] ̣· εἰ δὲ τὸν πον[
]ν ἐνιαυτὸν δ[
] ̣ ̣ [̣]μενοc ὑ[
ἤν]εγκε τ ̣ [
]ἐκεῖθε[ν
] ̣ ̣ [

. . . .

6 -πολησι- || 7] ̣ , ν rather than η (Schwartz) | εἶδε Mette : εἰ δὲ Luppe || 9 ϋ[

Unidentified fragments:

Ab (cf. pl. 9d)

. . .

]υc· τ[
]λ̣λ̣α[
]ελ ̣ [
]ηcαc[
]α̣νω̣[
] ̣ ̣ [

. . .

Ac (cf. pl. 9d)

. . .

]ε̣με[
]βει[
]νκ̣[
]ο̣τ[

. . .

4 or]ωτ[?

Ba

. . .

] ̣ ̣ τειμ̣[
] ̣ ̣ ταc̣ αυτ[
] ̣ ̣ εναντιτ ̣ [
]η· ̣ ηc̣[

. . .

1 μ̣[, or λ̣[

Bb

. . .

]ρ̣[
]τει[]εν·[
] ̣ ορω̣ν̣ ἕ[
]c̣ ̣ ̣ εκτ[
]υcεν c[

. . .

Bc

. . .

]να . [
] . ειν[
] . γαμο[
]ξιωθε[
]παιδα[
]ατου[
] . το[
] . [

. . .

2] . , γ, π or τ

Fr. 8 (Turner 103-110) + scrap without number *Syleus*, *Temenus*
cf. pl. VI ed. pr.; re-ed. by Austin 96, 98
On lines 5-8, cf. M.A. Harder, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 11, n. 12

. . . .]καὶ τὸν Συλέα ἀνας[τὴν
θυγα]τέρα τοῦ πρ̣οειρημ̣[ένου
]ν̣ος διωκομένη . [
] . ˙ τούτου[ς] μ̣ὲν οὖν̣[
] . ην . ε̣ ἔσωσεν.
Τ ή μ ε ν ο ς, οὗ ἀρχή˙
] . . π[. . .] . . [.]ως ἀ̣ρεί̣φατο[ς] τ̣ι̣ς̣[
] . [ἡ δ᾽ ὑπόθ]ε̣σις

. . . .

3 διώ- | . [, vertical, prob. ν || 4] . , upper part of vertical (before high stop) :]ν̣ ed. pr. || 5] . , dot; after ν slightly curved line at bottom || 6 αρ-χηι || 7] . . π[, high dot; oblique, prob. λ or α |] . . [, part of these traces might stem from ω || 8] . [, oblique from bottom to right top

On *Temenus* and *Temenidae* (fr. 8 end, frr. 9-11, fr. 107), cf.:
re-ed. by Austin 12, 97-98
M.A. Harder, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 7-14 (esp. on fr. 107); —, in: *Fragmenta Dramatica*, edd. H. Hofmann-M.A. Harder, Göttingen 1991, 117-135; J.S. Rusten, *ZPE* 40, 1980, 39-42; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 49, 1982, 15-21 + pl. Ia; —, *Prometheus* 13, 1987, 193-203; —, *Acta Antiqua* 32, 1989, 243-248; —, *APF* 41.1, 1995, 25-33 + pl. 17

Fr. 9 (Turner 111-126) *Temenus* or *Temenidae*

. . . .

] . [
] . [] . διαͺ[
. ε . . . ν[ ]ἡμιόνου μονοφθάλ[μου
ὑπέμνησεν χρησμοῦ τὸν Τήμ[ε]ν[ον, ὃς
ἐκέλευσεν τῆς εἰς Ἄργος κ[αθό]δου λαβεῖ[ν
α]ὐτοὺς ὁ[δηγ]ὸν τὸν τρ[ι]όφθαλμον· δ . [
. . . [ ]ντο . [] . ε τοῦ Ὀξύλου [τ]ὴν Πελο-
πόννησον εἰς] μέρη τρία· τ[ὴν μ]ὲν Ἀργεί-
αν] . . . [ ]ν[ ] πρεσ[βύ]τατος
τὴν δὲ] Μεσσηνίαν ἔ[λα]βεν Κρ[εσφόν-
της]τὴν δ[ὲ] Λακ[
οἱ Ἀριστο]δήμ[ου] παῖδες ἀδικη-
]ν . [] . [ ]αν μετα
] . . . . [π]αίδων ποι-
] . Ἀρχέλαον

. . . .

2] . [, long descender | δια is preceded by descending oblique || 3 . ε . . . ν[, κ (π unlikely); ε; δ or φ; round letter; high dot; ν | 3ff. suppl. Turner || 6 . [, upright || 8 τρια· || 12 ἄδικη || 15] . , upright

Fr. 10 (Turner 127-136) *Temenus* or *Temenidae*
pl. IX ed. pr.

Σ]πάρτην . . . . [.]νδ[
]μενος δὲ παρ[ὰ] τῶν[
]τος Τήμενος μερ . . [
εἰλή]φεν· παρ' ἑκόντων τ[
]νος ἐκλήρωσεν· ἔλαχεν[
] . . τὴν Μεσσηνίαν· τοῖς [δὲ
]παισὶν Ἀγασθένει καὶ ορ[
] . η[ ] . . . τῷ κλήρῳ
] . [ ]ως ἐνε . [
] . ιζ[

. . . .

3 . . [, upright plus small angle || 4 φεν· preferable to φει· (Luppe) in view of position of trace || 5 -σεν· || 6] . . , right part of η or c; then ε or c | -αν· || 7 αγασσθ- || 8] . , high dot |] . . . , high traces followed by oblique and upright, perhaps . . ν || 9 . [, γ (ed. pr.) or perhaps c followed by high dot || 10] . , λ or μ

Fr. 11 (Turner 137-153) *Temenidae* ?
pl. IX ed. pr.; pl. 17 in Luppe, *APF* 1995

. . . .
]. . [
]αρχ[. .]˙[
]ο̣δε[.] . δ̣ . [] . [
]νης υἱο̣ϲ ὢν ᾿Ορέ[ϲτου τοῦ
᾿Αγαμέ]μ̣νονοϲ˙ βαϲιλευ̣ϲ̣[
] .˙ . . . . νηγεμ̣[.] . [
]ω̣ν̣ ἔγνω τὴν π̣ε̣[
]θουμένην˙ ϲ̣υμβ̣ο̣υλο[
] . [. . .] τοῖϲ Τ[η]μένου πα . . . .()[
] . ε̣ν κατά̣̣ϲ̣κοπον εἰϲ Cπάρτ[ην
Μ]ε̣ϲϲήνην πῶϲ ἔχει τὰ τ .()[
] . ν πο̣λ[υ]πραγμονηϲ̣α̣[
ε]ὐτυχούντων ϲυ[
]ωκα˙ φαύλωϲ̣ δε̣[
] . ϲυμμαχ[
] . ε̣τον του[
] . . [
. . . .

4 υἵοϲ | ὂρε- || 5 -οϲ˙ || 6] .˙[.] ., top of round letter, perhaps c, followed by high stop; then π or τ; before ν perhaps ου or ϲυ; after ν perhaps ἡγεμ̣[ο]-ν̣[|| 8 -ην˙ | after the last ο is a small strip with a long vertical. It does not have to belong here || 10] . , high dot || 11 ἔχει | .()[, η or ι plus trace of another letter || 14 -ωκα˙

Fr. 11b (placed at the front of fr. 11, Turner 145-152)

. . .
] . [
] . []λ̣[
] . . μ . [
]ινα[
] . των̣[
] . . [
]ηδ . . [
] . χ̣[
. . .

1] . [, dot || 2] . , foot of vertical || 3 τ or υ; α?; μ; ϵ or c || 5] . , high traces || 6 γ or τ followed by η or κ || 7]ἢ | . . [, small upright stroke followed by ϵ, θ or c || 8] . , γ, τ or υ

Fr. 107 *Temenidae* ?
pl. Ia, *ZPE* 49, 1982
suppl. based on *P.Mich.* inv. 1319

. . . . .

]. πον . [
τ]ὴν βαcιλ[είαν
κ]ατὰ μάχη[ν
]τ̣ὸ μὲν οὖν κ̣[ρῖμα
]. τ̣ . [ ]ουcη . [
]. [

. . . .

1] . , ο seems preferable to υ :]υ̣πον̣[Turner :]ὸ̣ τῶν 'Η̣[ρακλειδῶν Luppe || 5 . [, one dot : to be supplemented with κ]α̣τ̣ὰ̣ [τ]οὺc 'Ηρ̣[ακλείδαc? cf. Harder (1979: 10)

Fr. 12 (Turner 154-162) *Telephus*?
pl. IX ed. pr.; cf. Austin 67

]τασιν τω . [
]c' καὶ cυμ . [. .]ε̣ . [
πε]μ̣ψ̣α̣[ι] περι̣ τη[ ] τ . .
]ω̣ . . [. ἐ]πὶ τ[ὸ]ν χρηcμὸν
ἀπέc]τ̣ειλεν' μ̣αθὼν̣ δ̣[ὲ] τ̣ου
] . ὅτι τον̣[ ] . . ξ[. . .]ν̣α̣
ἡγ]εμόνα δ̣εῖ ποιῆc̣[αι κ]αὶ
] . . . [ ]καὶ . . [ ] . ε
12] . . ' επ̣ . [ ] . ν

. . . .

1 . [, vertical || 2 c' | . [, vertical || 6 ὅτι | ξ preceded by horizontal in mid-line and low dot || 8 after και : τ plus high arcs (πλ Turner) |] . ε̈ || 9]ηι' rather than]ι̣ν̣' (Turner); then επ̣ followed by upright; before ν perhaps ε | . . [, high horizontal and small upright

Fr. 13 (Turner 163-171) *Troades*
cf. W. Luppe, in *Aristoteles Werk und Wirkung (Paul Moraux gewidmet)* I, 1985, 610-615

. . . .

μετὰ τὴν 'Ιλίου πόρθηcι]ν 'Αθηνᾶ τε
καὶ Ποcειδῶν(ι) τὸ τῶν 'Α]χαιῶν cτράτε̣υ̣-
μα διαφθεῖραι ?] . . α̣ . ' τοῦ μὲν ‹ -

νοοῦντος τῇ πόλει δι]ὰ τὴν κτ̣[ί]cιν· τῆc
δὲ μιcηcάcηc τοὺc Ἕλλ]ηναc δ[ι]ὰ τὴν̣
Αἴαντος εἰc Καccάν]δραν ὕβρ[ι]ν̣[·] ο[ἱ δὲ
Ἕλληνεc κληρωcάμεν]οι τῶ̣[ν] αἰχμαλ[ώ-
των γυναικῶν τὰc ἐκ] τ̣[οῦ δή]μο]υ̣ τοῖc
ἐν ἀξιώμαcιν ἔδωκαν Ἀγαμέμνο]νι

. . . .

1ff. suppl. based on OCT Diggle (1981) | 1]ν· || 3] . . α̣ .·, bottom of round letter, then small oblique at bottom perhaps part of ε or c; α followed by vertical and some high dots || 4 -cιν· || 5]ηναc· || 6 ὕβ- || 8]υ̣· | 8-9 suppl. Luppe

Fr. 14.1 (Turner 175-187; cf. 14.1a) *Tennes, Hypsipyle*
pl. IV ed. pr.; re-ed. by Austin 97 and in *TrGF* 1, 183 (= Critias F20)
cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *Gnomon* 35, 1963, 439-443; W. Luppe, *APF* 35, 1989, 7-10 + pl. 1; —, *APF* 39, 1993, 15-16

. . . .

]ο̣θ̣α̣ . [
] . [
μ]ά̣ρτυρα τω . [
c̣άμενοc· τα[
μ̣ε̣τεμελη[ ] . . . . ι τ̣ὸν Τ[έ]ν-
νην ἤκουcεν̣ ἐπὶ τὴν̣ ἀ̣ντιπέρα νῆcον
cεcῶcθαι· προει̣πό[ν]τοc δ' Ἀπόλλωνοc
τὴν μὲν νῆcο̣ν Τ̣ένεδον π̣ροcηγόρευcεν,
τ]ὴν δὲ ψευcα[μέν]ην̣ γυ̣ναῖκα ἀπ̣έκτεινεν.
Ὑ ψ [ι π] ύ̣ λ η, ἧc ἀρχή·
Δ]ι̣[όνυc]οc ὃ̣c̣ θ[ύρcοιc]ιν καὶ νε̣[βρ]ῶν
δο̣ρ̣αῖc̣ [ ] ἡ̣ δ' ὑ̣π̣[όθεcιc
] . . [

. . . .

1 . [, feet of two uprights || 2 foot of long descender :]κλειcαc̣[Turner || 3 . [, vertical || 4 -οc· || 7 -αι· | προcειπο[, corr. Lloyd-Jones || 8 last ν is written above ε || 9 νεν is written above τει || 10]υ̣ λ η ι ηc αρχηι̣ || 13 perhaps]ι̣κ̣[

Fr. 14.1a (end of Turner 172-175)

. . . .

]γυναικο̣c
] . . εα . τα .

]η[] . ι
] . ι
] .

. . .

1 c written above ο || 2] . . , horizontal plus υ | before τ: c followed by high stop or ϋ; after τα vague trace, perhaps c || 3]η, or π? |] . ι or ν? || 5 high dot

Fr. 14.2 (Turner 188-203) *Hypsipyle*
pl. IV ed. pr.
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 52, 1983, 43-44; —, *ZPE* 72, 1988, 27-33

. . . .

] . [ ] . [
γ[ ]θ̣ειc̣ατο . [
κρήνην ἔδειξ[ε
κ[] . τ̣οc διεcπ[ ]α̣δε . [
τ[ό]πουc οἱ γε̣γο̣νότεc . [ ] . . . παῖδεc π̣α̣ρ̣[ῆc]α̣ν
ἐπὶ τὴν τῆc μ̣ητ̣ρ̣ὸc̣ ζήτηcιν καὶ κατα-
λύcαντεc παρὰ τῇ τοῦ Λυκούργου γυναικὶ
τὸν ἐπιτάφιον τοῦ παιδὸc ἠθέληcαν ἀ-
γωνίcαcθαι· ἡ δ[ὲ] τ̣ο̣ὺc π[ρ]οειρημέν[ο]υ̣[c
ξενοδοχήc̣α̣cα· τούτ̣ο̣υ̣c̣ μὲν ἐπ̣ῄνεc̣[ε]ν̣
τὴν μ̣ητέρα δ' αὐτῶν ἀποκτείν̣ε̣ι̣ν̣ [ἤμελ-
λεν· [.()] . . κουcίω[c ἀπ]ολωλεκυ̣[ί]αc α[ὐ-
τῆ[c τὸ τ]έ̣κ̣ν̣ον· Ἀ[μφια]ράου δὲ̣ . . . .
c̣α̣μ̣[ ] τ̣ο̣υ̣τω[ ] χ[ά]ριν ἔδω[κεν
] . [ ] . . [ ] . [
] . ν . [

. . . .

1 first trace is foot of long descender; second is short horizontal || 3 διξ[|| 5 τ[ό]πουc supralinear | -νετεc | Ὑ[ψιπυ]λῃc Turner : . [, left part of round letter, e.g. ε, ο, c; after the lacuna unidentified traces; instead of Hypsipyle perhaps ἐ[ν ἡλικ]ίαι? || 8 ἅ- || 9 -αι· || 10 -cα· | επηνει previous edd. || 12 λεν· | [ὡ]c̣ ἑκου- Kannicht (private note) fits the traces | -κυ̣[ι]-ηc || 13 -ον· || 13-14 δὲ π̣α̣ρ̣α̣ι̣τη- | c̣α̣μ̣[ένου] τ̣ο̣ύτω[ι δὴ] Turner

Fr. 15 pl. IV ed. pr. *Hypsipyle*

. . . .

]ει[
Ἀμ]φιαρα̣[

π]αραγε[νομ
] . . . . μ . [
. . . .

4 high oblique, κ or χ?; small round trace, prob. ο; high round trace, top of β or ρ; top of vertical and high dot, η or κ; μ followed by round letter

Fr. 14.3 (Turner 218-232) + frr. 78, 85 *Hypsipyle, Phrixus I*
re-ed. by Austin 101
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 51, 1983, 25-28 + pl. II; —, *APF* 32, 1986, 5-13 + pl. 1

. . . .
α[
θ . . . cθαι[ ] .
ἐθ]ε̣cπιc[εν]
Φ ρ ί [ξ] ο̣ c π ρ ῶ̣ τ ο c, οὗ ἀρχή[·
εἰ μὲν τόδ' ἦμ̣αρ [π]ρῶτον ἦν κακουμ̣[έ-
νωι. ἡ δ' ὑπο̣θεcιc·
Ἀθάμαc υἱὸc με̣[ν] ἦν Αἰόλου· βαcιλεὺc
δὲ Θετταλίαc [εἶχε(ν)] δὲ παῖδα̣[c] ἐκ
Νε]φέληc Ἕλλη[ν τε κ]α̣ὶ Φρίξον. [] . . [
] . εν Ἰνῷ τὴ[ν Κάδμο]υ πα[ῖδα
]ο̣[κα]τ̣ὰ δὲ τῶν π[ρο-
γ]ό̣ν̣ω[ν ἐπιβουλὴν] ἐμηχανᾶτο κα[θά-
π̣ε̣ρ̣ φο[βουμένη τ]ὸ̣ν̣ τῆc μητρυι[ᾶ]c̣
πικρὸν̣ [βίον περὶ ἑαυτ]ῆι· cυγκαλέ-
cαcα γὰρ τῶν Θεττάλων γ]υ̣να[ῖκαc
. . . .

2] . , foot of an upright with a long horizontal stroke beneath it || 6 ἥ || 7 υϊοc || 8ff. suppl. based on Luppe (1986) || 9-10 [ἐ]π̣ε̣[- | γη]μ̣εν Luppe is better compatible with traces than [c]υ̣ν̣[ῴι- | κηc]εν Kannicht (private note) | εινωι || 14 ηι· cυνκαλε

Fr. 16 *Phrixus I* ?

. . . .
]οc· Ἰνώ[
]ε̣ν ὅτι φ[
] . . . ε̣ . [
. . . .

1 οc· || 2 ὅτι || 3 perhaps α followed by oblique stroke and slightly curved horizontal traces at top and bottom (e.g. c); ε̣ followed by high horizontal, e.g. τ :] . α̣π̣ε̣ . [Turner

Fr. 14.4 (Turner 233-245; cf. fr. 14.4a below) *Phrixus I, Phoenix*
pl. 2, *APF* 32, 1986
re-ed. by Austin 101-102

. . . .
]̣[
]̣ το[
̣[ ]ηι˙ τ[κ]ι̣νδυ̣ν[
διδον[ ]ων[ἀ]ναγκαιό[
τερον ἡγησά[με]ν̣ος ἢ πατρὶ κίνδυνον
ἐπιστήσαν̣[ ] δ̣ι̣ὰ̣ γυναῖκα
Φ ο ῖ ν[ι̣ ξ, ο]ὖ ἀρ[χ]ή[˙
ὦ πλοῦτε ὅ[cῳ μὲν ῥ]ᾶ[ιcτον εἶ β]άροc
φέ̣ρε[ιν. ἡ δ' ὑ]πό[θεcιc˙
'Α̣μ̣ύ̣[ντ ̣]ρο[
β]α̣cι[λ
. . . .

2]̣ , upright; then τ̣ preferable to π̣ || 3 -ηι˙ || 4 ε written above ων | -καιὄ || 5 ἤγη- | νοc˙ ἤ | text by Luppe (1983, see above) || 7 Φοινι̣ξ Turner : a separate scrap has been attached to φοιν : oblique, vertical and high dot with a line below these traces (perhaps the scrap is upside down) || 8 ὄ[|| 9 sic Turner but]̣ ο[(]̣ , high horizontal, π possible) is a separate fragment

Fr. 14.4a (Turner 233-239)

. . .
]̣[
]̣ φ[
]τ̣ ̣[
] ̣ ̣[
]ου ̣[
]λλ[
]κε[
. . .

3]τ̣ or]π̣ || 5 ̣[, perhaps c

Fr. 14.5 (Turner 205-217) *Phaëthon*
re-ed. by Austin 99
cf. J. Diggle, *Euripides Phaethon*, Cambridge 1970, 53 and 75-78; W. Luppe, *Phil.* 127, 1983, 135-139

. . . .

δ[. . . .]cηc˙ τ[Μέ-
ροπι δὲ μετα[ἐγέν-
νηcεν˙ πάντων δὲ [π]α[τ]έρα ἔφη[cε]ν τ[ὸν
κατὰ νόμουc cυ[νοι]κοῦντα εἶναι[˙] γε-
νηθέντι δ' ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τῷ Φαέθοντι
τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξέφηνεν˙ ἀπιcτοῦντι
δὲ ὥc ἐcτιν Ἡλ[ί]ου παῖc προcέταξεν
ἐ[λ]θεῖν πρὸc τὰc ἱπ[ποcτ]άcειc τοῦ θεο[ῦ
γει]τνιώcαc˙ καὶ δῶρ[ο]ν αἰτήcαcθα[ι
]ηcη[ι]˙ [π]αραγενηθεὶc δεκ[
] . εραγε[. .] . θεοῦ . . []cα . [
] . μου γε[νέc]θαι . . [
] . χη[ ] . . [

. . . .

1 -cηc˙ || 2-3 ἐγέν- | νηcεν˙ πάντων Diggle | ἔφη[cε]ν τ[ὸν Luppe : εφ[η το]ν Turner || 4 cυ[νοι]κοῦντα complures : cυ[μβι]οῦντα Turner || 5 ἡλι- | -θοντι˙ || 6 αληθεαν | -νεν˙ || 7 παιc˙ || 8 ϊπ- || 9 -cαc˙ || 9-10 ὃ | ἂν ἐθελ]ήcη[ι] Diggle p. 77 || 10]˙ | -ηιθειc || 11] . , ρ or ι (ed. pr.) suggested by vertical stroke above ο | vertical before θεου not necessarily ι (ed. pr.) || 12] . , ε or c (ed. pr.) || 13 first] . , vertical ()ι ed. pr.)

Fr. 17.1 (Turner 246-263) *Philoctetes*
re-ed. by Austin 100
cf. W. Luppe, *Anagennesis* 3.2, 1983, 187-200 + pl. IV; —, *Tyche* 7, 1992, 163-164; —, *Würzb. Jahrb.* 19, 1993, 47-53; C.W. Müller, *ZPE* 98, 1993, 19-24

. . . .

. . [
. . ρα[. .]cαc Φιλοκτ[ή]τ[ ] . .
λεύοντοc ἐν τοῖc τ[ό]ποιc [ἐν οἷc ἐδ]ή-
χθη˙ περιαλγῆ δ' α[ὐτὸν γενόμ]ενον
ἐπὶ τὴν παρακειμένην Λ[ῆ]μνον δια-
κομ[ί]cαντεc εἴαcαν˙ ὁ δὲ τὸν δεκαετῆ
χρό[ν]ον διέζηcεν ἀτυχῶν, ὡc ἂν βίον
ἔχ[ων] τὸν ἔλεον τῶν ἐντυγχαν[ό]ντων˙
. [ ] . () . ακα . Ἕλενοc εἶπεν τοῖc Τρωcὶ τοῖ[c
Ἡρακλέο[υc] τόξοιc ἀcφαλίcαcθαι τὴν πό-
λιν καὶ λ[η]φθεὶc δ' αἰχμάλωτοc τὴν αὐ-
]() . . . c cυμμαχ[. ()] . . [. . ()]ιcεν

]τọṿ Φιλοκτ̣[ήτ
] Ὀ̣δυccεὺc̣ εκ̣[
ἐνε]τ̣ε̣ίλατο μὲν ἐμφ[
]Ἀ̣θηνᾶc βου[λ
] . η[ ]ṿτο[
]φ . [
. . . .

2] . . , first ο or ω; then ι or υ || 3]ηι || 4 χθηι˙ περιαλγηι || 6 ϊαcαν˙ | δεκαετηι || 7 ἀτυχων˙ || 8 ελαιον | -των˙ || 9 . [ ] . () ., lower part of loop, perhaps α; after [] high round trace, ε or ρ; space for one narrow letter; then γ or τ | ἔλενοc preceded by narrow letter || 12]() . . . , two dots at bottom which can stem from one or two letters because there is some space inbetween; horizontal and upright, prob. ει |] . . [, two small horizontals || 15 \μεν/ εμφ[

Fr. 17.2 (Turner 264-279) + 139 *Philoctetes, Phrixus II*
re-ed. by Austin 100, 102
cf. W. Luppe, *APF* 30, 1984, 31-37+ pl. 1; —, *APF* 39, 1993, 13

. . . .
] . εκα̣ . [.] (). [
τ]ὴν ἀcφάλει-
αν˙ ἀναγκάζει[ν]α̣ῦν cυνακ[ο]λουθε̣ῖν
Φ ρ ί ξ ο c δ [ε] ύ [τ] ε ρ̣ ο c, οὗ ἀρχή˙
Cε̣ιδώνιον τ̣ότ' ἄ̣cτυ Κάδμοc̣ ἐκλιπών
ἡ δ' ὑπόθ̣εcιc̣˙
Ἀθάμαc ἐν Ὀρχομε[νῷ] . . . ν
Ἰν]ο̣ῖ τῇ Κάδμ̣ο̣ṿ c̣ṿν[δύο] παῖδ̣αc
ἐκ Ν]ε̣φέληc προγε̣γεν[νηκὼc Ἕλλην τε
καὶ] Φ̣ρ̣ίξον˙ οἷc μ[ ] . . . [
. . . .]ρι[ ] . ειτο[
. . . .]πολ[
. .] . τ̣εινομ[
.] . αντεc˙ Ἀθ[αμα
]του[
]Φ̣ρι[
. . . .

1] . , foot of upright | . [.] (). [, low dot, lacuna, upright with high horizontal traces before it || 3 αν˙ | θε̣ι̣ν written above line || 4 αρχηι || 5 ἔγλιπων || 6 ἥ || 8 Ιν]ω̣ι̣ || 10 -ον˙ || 11]ρϊ[| first part of 11 and 12-16 form a separate fragment which may (not) belong here or should perhaps be

placed further to the right immediately before] . ειτο || 13] . , oblique trace || 14] . , low dot | -τες˙

Fr. 17.3 (Turner 280-290 + fr. 19 + T. 172-174) *Phrixus II, Phoenissae*
cf. Austin 102-103; R.A. Coles-J.W.B. Barns, *CQ* n.s. 15, 1965, 52-57; Barrett (1965: 58-71); Haslam (1975: 151); W. Luppe, *Phil.* 126, 1982, 313-315; —, *APF* 30, 1984, 31-37; ed. OCT Diggle (1994: 75-77)

. . . .

] . [
]τῳ ἐπιβο̣[υλ]ευομέν̣[ῳ
ἡ δὲ τ̣ὸν Διόν[υcον] ἐπικαλε[cα]μ̣έν̣η τ̣[ὸν
θάνατον διώλιcθεν˙ ἐμμανεῖc γὰρ π[οι-
ή̣c̣α̣c̣ . Δ[ι]όνυcοc Φρίξον τε κ̣αὶ Ἕλλην̣ τ̣ή̣[ν
ἀδε[λ]φ[ὴ]ν προηγάγετο εἰc τὴν ἐρημ̣[ο]ν
ὡ[c] παρανάλωμα τῶν Μαινάδων ποι-
ήcων̣˙ Νεφέλη δ̣ὲ κατάπταcα καὶ διαρ-
πάcαcα τού[c] ἑαυ[τῆ]c̣ κ̣ρ̣ι̣[ὸ]ν̣ ἔ̣δωκε[ν] αὐ-
τοῖc ὁδηγ . [ ] .()[Κόλ]χ̣ο̣υc
Φ [ο] ι̣ ν̣ ι̣ c̣ c α ι, ὧν ἀρχή˙
Ἥ[λ]ι̣ε̣ [θ]ο̣[α]ῖ̣[c ἵπποιcι]ν ε̣ἱλίcc̣[ων] φλ[όγ]α̣˙
ἡ δ' ὑπόθ]εcιc[˙
Ἐτεοκλῆc παραλαβ]ὼ̣ν̣ τὴν [ἐν Θή]βαιc βα[cι-
λείαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Πολυ]ν[είκη]ν ἀπε[cτέ-
ρηcε(ν) τοῦ δικαίου˙ φυγὰc δ' ἐκ]εῖ̣ν̣οc εἰc̣[
] . . . . . . [
] . . . [

. . . .

1] . [, foot of descender || 3 μενηι || 4 -λ̣ιccθεν || 5 ηc̣α̣c̣ followed by high dot, cf. Turner [ο] || 6 ἄδε[| beneath -ημ[is χω̣[|| 8 -λη̣ι̣ || 9]c̣˙ κ̣ρ̣ει̣[ο]ν̣ || 10 γ followed by one dot in the middle; lacuna; obscure traces of one or two letters : ὁδηγηc̣[αι] κ̣[αλ]ω̣c Turner : ὁδηγε̣[ῖν ε]ἰ̣[c Κόλχ]ο̣[υ]c Luppe (1984) || 11-χηι || 12 on this reading, cf. Haslam 151 || 17-18 (= fr. 19, 7-8) unidentified traces :] . . c˙μ̣ . α̣[| . . . . .]α . . [Turner

Frr. 48, 125 *Phoenissae*
identified by Barrett, op. cit.

. . . .

Τειρεc]ί̣[αc] δ̣[ὲ ἔχρηcε(ν) νικῆcειν] το[ὺc ἐκ
τῆc πό]λ̣εωc [ἐὰν ὁ Κρέοντοc υἱὸc] Μεν[οι-
κεὺc cφ]άγιον̣ [Ἄρει γένηται. ὁ] μ̣[ὲν

οὖν νε]α̣ν̣ί̣c̣κ̣[oc ἑκουcίωc ἑαυτὸν
ἀπέcφ]α̣ξ̣ε̣[ν· Θηβαῖοι δὲ τοὺc ἡγεμό-
ναc] τῶν Ἀρ̣[γείων

. . . .

suppl. based on OCT Diggle (1994: 75ff.)

Fr. 17.4 (Turner 291ff.) + fr. 56 *Phoenissae, Chrysippus*
cf. Austin 103

. . . .

τεc ἀ̣[λλήλουc ἀνεῖλον. ἡ μὲν οὖν μήτηρ
αὐτ[ῶν] Ἰοκ[άcτη νεκροὺc εὑροῦcα τοὺc
παῖδαc ἑαυτ̣[ὴν προ]c̣ε[π]έcφ[αξ]εν, ὁ [δὲ
ταύτηc ἀδελ̣[φὸc] Κ̣ρέων̣ παρέλ[αβεν
τὴν β̣α̣cιλείαν· [ο]ἱ̣ δὲ Ἀρ̣[γ]ε̣ῖοι τῆι̣ μ̣ά̣χη[ι τ]ρ̣[ε-
φθέντεc ἀπε[χώρ]ηc̣[αν.] Κ̣[ρ]έων̣ δὲ παρρ̣η-
c̣ιαcτικώτερο̣[ν] τ̣ῆι̣ τ̣ύ̣[χη]ι̣ χ̣ρ̣ώμενοc
τοὺc ὑπὸ τ̣ὴν Κ̣αδμείαν τῶν π̣ολεμίων
πεc̣[ό]ν̣τ̣[α]c̣ ε̣ἰc τ[α]φὴν οὐκ [ἔ]δωκεν· Πολυ-
νείκην δ' ἀκ̣ήδ̣ε̣υτον ἐρει[ψε]ν̣· Οἰδίποδ[α
δὲ φ̣υγάδα τῆc̣ π̣[όλεωc] ἀ̣π̣έ̣c̣τειλε[
ἐφ' ὧν̣ [μὲν ο]ὐ̣ φυλ̣ά̣ξ̣[αc τὸ]ν ἀνθρώπων̣[
μο]ν· [ἐφ' ὧν δὲ τὴν ὀργὴ]ν οὐ λοιπογρα̣[
cαc[
ἐ̱λεήc[αc.
Χ[ρ ύ c ι π π ο c, οὗ ἀρχή·
] . αι . [

. . . .

3 ἑαυ- || 4 Κρέων· || 8 ὑπο || 10 ἐρει- || 11-14 I have not supplemented line endings to stress the fact that only this text belongs to the *Phoenissae-hyp.* Turner 301-307 shows a text that consists of several scraps which do not belong together. This means that the end of the *hyp.* may be more similar to the med. *hyp.* than was hitherto thought. Probable line endings of 11-13 are: 11 [ν, 12 [νό-, 13 [φη-. The following scraps were placed together:

Fr. 17.4a (placed at the end of Turner 301ff. = my ll. 11ff. of fr. 17.4):

. . .

] . [
] . ο [
]ψη [

]χειc [
]   [
]. [
]. [
]. [
. . .

1 thick low dot and small high dot || 2] . , dot and upright :]νο̣[Turner || 3 φη Turner || 5-7 empty || 8 top of ρ or small ο?

Fr. 17.4b

Turner's *παρα* in 304 consists of two small scraps; the first shows an upright plus high horizontal. Beneath this letter is a horizontal stroke; the second scrap is] . α̣ . α̣[ ] . : first a curved trace (η, κ, π, c?) followed by α, then a long descender of ι or rather ρ, then α followed by a space of one or two letters, a dot and a high horizontal. Below these letters is a horizontal line.

Fr. 17.4c (part of Turner 304ff.)

. . .
] . [
] . [
]α̣ρχηι[
] . [
] . [
. . .

1 small vertical stroke, probably the foot of a letter || 2 oblique and upright, prob. ν, followed by horizontal line to fill the space || 4 curved trace || 5 dot, foot of upright and thick arc, together η?

Fr. 17.4d

Below and to the left of ελεηc is another small scrap:] . δ̣[, two dots and a low horizontal with a small oblique at the right side (previously interpreted as the beginning of the paragraphus beneath εληεc). Beneath these traces it is empty.

Fr. 21 end of one *hyp.* plus beginning of another

. . . .
] . ι
]ωνο̣c cθενο̣c
]——
ἀρ]χ̣η[·
. . . .

See ed. pr. p. 47-54 for the text of the other small fragments.

17 *P.Oxy.* 52, 3653 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. H.M. Cockle, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52, London 1984, 27-39 + pl. III, V
re-ed. in *TrGF* 3, 575-576 cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 60, 1985, 11
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to S. *Nauplius katapleon, Niobe*

Fr. 1

14 Να]ύπλιο̣ς, ὃc τὴν κρίc̣ιν ἀθε̣τε̣ῖ
16] . . [.] . c̣ ὑπάρχειν τού̣τ̣[.] . . μ̣ὲ̣ν
]κα̣ὶ̣ π̣ρ̣ὸc α̣ὐ̣τοὺc κ[α]λῶc ὁ̣μιλῆ-
cαι]κελ̣ε̣ύ̣ε̣ι. κατοδυρομ̣έ̣νου δ' Οἴα̣-
κοc 10 Ναύ]πλ̣ι̣ο̣c ἀποπλεῖ τοῖc Ἕλληcιν̣ α̣-
]
ο]ὖ̣ ἀ̣ρ̣[χὴ] ἥδε·
] . . . ι̣c ἡλίο̣υ τέκνα. ἡ δ' ὑπό̣θεcιc·
] . . . . . . το . [.] . ον cτέρξαcα πολλα
14]διαν α̣μ̣ε̣ίνο̣να̣ τ̣ῆc Λητοῦ̣c ἔφηcεν
]δὲ ἐπ̣ὶ̣ θήραν̣ τοὺc ἄ̣ρ̣ρ̣εν̣α̣c̣ μετὰ
]ιν ἐπ' α̣ὐ̣τοῖ̣c [.]εμε . . . . ημ̣[. .] . c̣ε̣ν̣
ὑ]πά̣ρ̣χο̣υ̣cα μ̣ήτη[ρ] τῶ̣νδε κ̣α̣τὰ τὰc̣
]ν̣ γυνα̣[. .] . ν̣[7]cχήματι πα[
]οcαυτ̣η . κα̣[7]τ̣α̣c̣ μ̣ε̣μ-
]υ̣cπα[. . .] . [10] . c̣εαυ[
]ε̣ι̣γον̣[16]ω̣c̣α
]c̣επ . [16] . . ει
]ε[.]υ̣c̣[18] .c
] . . [
. . . .

3 ομειλη || 7 Νιόβη suppl. ed. pr. || 9] . περιc[[. τ]] cοτ[ε]ρον cτερξαcα Parsons ap. ed. pr. preferable to]ν Νιόβη τὸν γόνον cτέρξαcα ed. pr. || 12 εμεγαλορημ[ον]ηcεν Parsons ap. ed. pr.

Fr. 2 col. I — col. II

. . . .

	col. I	col. II
	Λ]ητὼ γὰρ α . [	
	]μεν αὐτοὺc α[	α[
	]ων ἐκείνηc ο[	λ . [
	]τηνα . ειρουν[	ε . . [
	]Λητ[ο]ῦc ο[	. . [
	]ν . . εραδ[	. [
	]ηc ἐπεκαλ[	. [
	] . αυτηc[	
	] . cτηνι[. .] . [. .] . [	
	] . [.] . [. . .] . ορον [δ]ιὰ τὰ ταράγμ[ατα	. [
	ἐ]ν βο[υλή]ματι διαμένουcα το[	
	] . [. .] λαβέcθαι θυμὸν . [	
	] . λυccῶν φόβῳ κ . [	
	]αυτηc[. .] . . . θεν . [. . .] . . . [	
	]κω . αc . [. .] . . . [.]αιτη . . . . [. .] . . . . . . [.] . [	
	]ειvον . [. . .] . . . . . ε . ρο[7] . . . . [	. [
	] . [. .] . . [	. . [. .] .
	]c δύο κ . . ιζ . τι . . εγον [. . .]cεν	.] . [.] .
	]εc δὲ τὴν ἀπώλειαν αὐτῶν ἐξ Ἀπόλλω-	ετ . [.] . . [
νοc 7	Νιό]β[η] δὲ τού[τ]οιc οὐ cυμπαθοῦcα κατα	απε[
	] . . . [.] . οικο . . . . τοὺc νεκροὺc ἐκαλεc[	. . [.] . c[
	] . πυθόμενοc δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἀμφί[ω]ν ὠνείδι-	τα . . c[
cε	] . . η κατ[ὰ] π[ρ]όcωπον εἰc μάχην καταν-	. . . . [
	] . η . . . . c δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καθοπλιcα[μ]ε-	αν . . [
	τοξ]ευθεὶc μετήλλαξεν. Ἀπόλλων δενε[	.] . [
	Ἀρτέ]μιδι καὶ τὰc κατ' οἶκον κόραc ἐτόξευcεν	ο . . [
	]cδα[. . .] . ιν τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τοῖc θεοῖc	. αι . [
	π]αραγεν[όμ]ενοc δὲ Ζῆθοc Νιόβην μεν	. . . [

37 εγον[[ωc]], ωc deleted in lighter ink; same hand has inserted letters above, of which only feet survive:] . [. .] . . [ed. pr. || 38]εc \δε/ την || 41 -τα \ο/ Αμφι[ω]ν ωνιδι || 43 καταν]τήcαντοc Rea ap. ed. pr. : παραγε]νηθέντοc Diggle (letter) || 47 Νιοβη\ν/

col. ii, 45 Luppe (1985) suggests the reading ὦ τέ[κνα, the beginning of the first verse of *OT*, but ω and τ do not fit the traces very well

18 *P.Oxy.* 42, 3013 Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. P.J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 42, London 1974, 46-50 + pl. III
re-ed. by Radt, *TrGF* 4, 435-436
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp.* to S. *Tereus*

Col. I

Τηρεύς· [ἡ ὑ]π̣ό̣θεσις
Π]ανδίων ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δυνάστης,
ἔ]χων θυγατέρας Πρόκνην καὶ Φιλο-
μ]ήλαν, τὴν πρεσβυτέραν
Πρ]όκνην Τηρεῖ γάμωι ἔζευξεν [τ]ῶι
τῶ]ν Θρ̣ᾳκῶν βασιλεῖ, ὃ̣ς ἔσχεν ἐξ
αὐ]τῆς υἱὸν προσαγορεύσας
Ἴτυ̣ν· χρόνου δὲ διελθόντος καὶ
βουλομένης τῆς Πρόκνης θεά-
σασθαι τὴν ἀδελφήν, ἠξίωσε τὸν
Τηρέα πορεύσασθαι εἰ̣ς Ἀθήνας
ἄξειν· ὁ δὲ παραγενόμενος εἰς
Ἀθήνας καὶ ἐπ[. . . . .] . θεὶς ὑπὸ
τοῦ Πανδίονος [τὴν πα]ρ̣θένον καὶ
μεσοπορήσας [ἠράσθ]η τῆς παι-
δός· ὁ δὲ τὰ πισ[τὰ οὐ φ]υ̣λάξας
διεπαρθένευ[σεν· εὐλ]αβουμε-

1 first line written in the upper margin | perhaps [ἡ δ' ὑ]- || 2 δυνης || 3 and 5 προκην || 4 πρεσβυτερωτέραν corr. Rea ap. Parsons || 6 ε̣ξ ed.pr. : I discern only [ε]ξ || 13 ἐπ[ιτρε]φ̣θεὶς (pot. qu. ἐγ[χειρι]σ̣θεὶς) Radt || 15]ηι

Col. II

νος δὲ μὴ τῇ ἀ̣[δελφῇ μηνύσῃ
ἐγλωσσοτόμη[σε τὴν παῖδα·
παραγενάμενος [δὲ εἰς τὴν
Θρᾳ̣κην καὶ τῆς Φ[ιλομήλας οὐ
δυναμένης [ἐκλαλεῖν τὴν
συμφορὰν δι' ὕφο[υς ἐμήνυσε·
ἐπιγνοῦσα δὲ ἡ Πρ[όκνη τὴν ἀλή-
θειαν ζηλοτυπ[ίᾳ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ
οἰστρηθεῖσα καὶ[
νη υ̣ . ερεινοις λα[βοῦσα τὸν

Ἴτυν ἐcφαγίαcε [καὶ καθεψήcα-
cα παρέθηκε [τῷ Τηρεῖ· ὁ δὲ τὴν
βορὰν ἀγνοῶν [ἔφαγεν· αἱ δὲ φυγα-
δευθεῖcαι ἐγέ[νοντο ἡ μὲν
ἀηδὼν ἡ δὲ χε̣[λιδών, ἔποψ
δὲ ὁ Τηρεύc[

21 τη\c/φ[|| 23 cυνφο- || 30 αγ'νοων

19 *P.Vindob.G.* 29779 (*MPER* N.S. 1, 24) ?, IV-V

ed. pr. fr. 2: H. Gerstinger, *MPER* N.S. 1, 24, Wien 1932; cf. Pack 1714
ed. pr. of other fragments: R. Kannicht, *Würzburger Jahrbücher* NF 1, 1975, 71-82, and 2, 1976, 237
re-ed. by W. Luppe, *WS* NF 19, 1985, 89-104 incl. plates
cf. W. Luppe, *APF* 37, 1991, 88
* text based on re-ed. Luppe

Contents: *hypp.* to S. *Philoctetes, Oedipus Tyrannus, Oedipus Coloneus, Ajax*

Fr. 1

p. 1 ↓
coφ[
λου[
το . [
. .

p. 2 →
]cε(ν)
]cτωι
]νιων
. .

p. 15 →
π̣ρ̣ . . . [
του[
χα̣λ[
. [
. [
[
. . .

p. 16 ↓
] . [.]φελῶ(ν)
]περὶ μὲ(ν)
] . . . . [.]
] . α̣
] . νηι
. . .

5 Kannicht discerns another trace beneath η :] .

Fr. 2 → *Ph.*

. . . .
] . . [ ] . . [
] ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν [.] . . [

Φι]λοκτήτην ο . . [
τ]ῆς καύσεως επ . [
]ε τότε τῆς . . . . [
] . ς διὰ τοῦτ[ο
] χειν[

. . . .

Fr. 2 ↓ *OT*

. . . .

] . χ . [ ]λας
ἐν] τριπλαῖς ὁδοῖς
κταν]ὼν φυτοσπόρο(ν)
ἑπτάπ]υργον ἐς χθόνα
] . . . . οὐ μαθὼ(ν)
]μιαιφόνος
] . δω . [

. . . .

1 [?τά]λας? Luppe : ἔρχο[μαι τά]λας Gerstinger/Kannicht

Fr. 3 a, b ↓ *OT*

. . . .

] . . . [
πρὸ τ]ῶν Τρω[ι]κῶν τοὺς [β]ασι[λ]έας προσαγο-
ρεύοντε]ς, ὀψέ ποτε τοῦδ[ε] τοῦ ὀνόματος εἰ[ς
τοὺς Ἕλλ]ηνας διαδ[οθέντο]ς κ(α)τὰ τοὺς Ἀρ[χι-
λόχου χρό]νους, καθάπερ [Ἱππί]ας ὁ φιλόσοφ[ος
]ν. Ὅμηρος γ[οῦν τὸν] παραν[ομώ-

. . . .

4 δαιδ[|| 5 χρο]νος

Fr. 3 a, b → *OC*

. . . .

τῷ πυ]θόχρηστον ἐνταῦθα δεῖν αὐτὸ[ν
ταφῆς] τυχεῖν· ἐν δὲ τῶι ἑτέρωι βέβηλ[ος
τόπος ἐσ]τίν τις, ὅπου . [. . . . . .]ται. καὶ κ(α)τ[ὰ
μικρὸν α]ὐτῶι τὰ τῆς [ὑποθ]έσεως προέρχ[ε-
ται· ὁρᾷ γάρ τις] αὐτ[ὸν τῶν α]ὐτόθεν κα[ὶ πο-
ρεύεται] . [] . [

. . . .

Fr. 4 → ?

. . . .

] . [ ] . . . [c]υνε̣[cτηκεν
]ων προλογίζει ο[

For possible supplements, cf. Luppe 1991.

Fr. 4 ↓ *Aj.*

. . . .

] . . [
] . . [. ()] . ματόc ἐcτ[ι
] . . . τοc μαcτιγο . [
ὑ]πόκειται μεμ . [
] . [.] . . cε . . . . . . ()ω[
] [

Fr. 5 → *OC* ?

. . . . .

] . α ον̣ . [
] . γωνα . [
]ἐ̣cτι κοι̣[
]αι τὰc πλ̣[
]ν̣οc ε[
] . . . [

. . . . .

Fr. 5 ↓ ?

. . . .

] . ουαι[
]πα̣ι̣δα[
]τοῦ πα[
]μεμη . ()[
]οφο̣[
] . . . [

. . . .

3 or κολ̣[|| 5 or] . ιοc?

20 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2256 (fr. 1-5) Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20, London 1952, 29-32 + pl. V
re-ed. in *TrGF* 1 and 3 (precise indications are given below)
cf. Pack 46; *GMAW* 25
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to A. *Laius, Danaides, Philoctetes* ?

fr. 1 (cf. *TrGF* 3, p. 231) *Laius*

. . . .

] ζων Λά̣[ϊοc
] [ ] [

] [
]τὰ π[ρ]όcω[πα·
] Λάϊ[οc

. . . .

5 λαϊ[

fr. 2 (cf. *TrGF* 1 DID C 4a, p. 43-44) *Laius*

ΑΙCΧΥΛΟ]Ῡ

ἐπὶ ἄρχοντ(οc) Θεαγ]ενίδου Ὀλ[υ]μπιάδοc [οη′ ἔτει] α[′
ἐνίκα Αἰcχύλ]οc Λαΐωι, Οἰδ[ί]ποδι, Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβαc,
Cφιγγὶ cατυ(ρικῆ).] δεύτεροc Ἀριcτίαc ταῖc τοῦ πα-
τρὸc Πρατίνο]υ τραγωιδ[ί]αιc. τρί[τ]οc [Πο]λυ-
φράcμων] Λυκουργε[ίᾳ] τ[ετρ]αλογίαι.

3 λαϊ- | θηβα\ι/c || 4 -ροc αρ- || 5]αιc· τρι-

Fr. 3 (*TrGF* 3, T 70, p. 54-55) *Danaides*

ἐπὶ α . [
ἐνίκα [Αἰ]cχύλο[c
Δαν[αΐ]cι, Ἀμυ[μώνῃ
δεύτ[ε]ρ[ο]c Cοφοκλῆ[c, τρίτοc
Μέcατοc ⟦Ν . [.] . [
⟦Βάκχαιc Κωφοῖ[c
Ποι]μέcιν Κυκ . [
] cατ^{υ} [
] [

3 one dot of diaeresis on iota visible

Fr. 4 (*TrGF* 3 F 451v, p. 496)

ἡ μὲν] cκηνὴ τοῦ δρά-[
ματο]c ὑπόκειται ἐν[
. . . . .]· ὁ δὲ χο(ρὸc) cυνέcτη-
κεν ἐ]κ πολιτῶν γε-
ραιῶ]ν· ὁ προλογίζ[ω](ν)

. . . . . .

Fr. 5 (*TrGF* 3 F 451w, p. 496-497) *Philoctetes* ?

(a) (b)

] . αδυνα . . .
] . ληµφθ^η] .
ἔπε]µπον]τ̣ον
Φ]ι̣λ̣[ο̣]κ̣τ̣[η]] . αυ
π]αρ' Εὐρι-]ενο
πίδῃ Νεο]π̣τολεµ^ο] .
]Φ̣ι̣λοκτ^η] . .
'Οδυς]cεύς]
] . . .
]
]ω οὗ

. . . .

11 ὄυ̂

21 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2257, fr. 1 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20, London 1952, 66-68 + pl. IX
re-ed. in *TrGF* 3 F 451 t 1, p. 494 + pp. 126-127
cf. Pack 47
* inspexi; text based on re-ed.

Contents: *hyp.* to A. *Aetnaeae* ?

Fr. 1

. . . .

] . . . [. . .] . φ[
]˙ . . . ωναφ[. .] . . . . . . [
] . . [. .]˙ταṫ . . [.] . α̣ρ̣ . . π̣αζ˙
] . [.]παυτ˙[. .] . . ρα . . . . [
] . . [. .] . µ̣˙ ˙[.] . . ε^τ . ι̣τε Αἰcχύ̣(λος)
] . . [. .] . θην . . ε̣κ̣ . . φων µ̣(ετα)
] . αζε̣ . . . . [. .] . . ˙ . . τρωϊ . . . φ ˙ ^λ
.]ο̣ι 'Αχιλ(λέως) ἐρα[c]τ̣αί. κ(ατὰ) µ(ὲν) γ(ὰρ) τὸ πρῶτον µ(έρος) αὐτοῦ ἡ cκηνὴ ὑ(πό)κε[ι]τ(αι) Αἴτνη, κ(ατὰ) δ(ὲ) τὸ δεύτ(ερον) Ξουθία, κ(α)τ(ὰ) δὲ [τ]ὸ τρίτον πάλιν Αἴτνη, εἶτ' ἀπὸ ταύτης εἰ[c Λε]ο̣ν̣τίνους µ(ε)τ(α)βάλλει καὶ γί(νεται) ἡ cκηνὴ Λεον[. . .], µ(ε)τ(ὰ) δ' αὐτὸν Cυρακοῦccαι,

καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ[ ]τ̣ηι δ(ια)περαίνετ(αι),
ὅς (ἐςτι) τοπ̣( )[

8 *μ(έρος)* add. Lobel || 10 *ξουθεια* || 13 [*ἐν τῷ Τεμενί*]*τ̣ηι* suppl. Pfeiffer ap. ed. pr.

22 *P.Oxy.* 4, 663 Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 4, London 1904, 69-72
re-ed. by Austin, *CGFPR* 70, (= p. 35-37 with extensive bibliography) and by Kassel-Austin, *PCG* 4, 1983, 140-141
cf. Pack 252; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 110, 1966, 169-193 incl. pl.; —, *ZPE* 72, 1988, 37-38; E.W. Handley, *BICS* 29, 1982, 114-115 + pl. VII
* inspexi; text based on ed. *PCG*

Contents: *hyp.* to Cratinus *Dionysalexandros*

Col. I

. . . .
] .
. . . .]*ζητ( )*
. . . .]*παν*
. . . .]*α̣υτον μη*
. . . . . *κ*]*ρ̣ίςιν ὁ Ἑρμ(ῆς)*
ἀπέρχ]*εται κ(αὶ) οὗτοι*
μ(ὲν) π̣ρ̣(ὸς) τοὺς θεατὰς
τινα π(ερὶ) υων ποιη( )
διαλέγονται κ(αὶ)
παραφανέντα τὸν
Διόνυςον ἐπιςκώ(πτουςι) (καὶ)
χλευάζου(ςιν)· ὁ δ(ὲ) πα-
ρ̣α̣γενομένω̣ν̣ ⟨
⟩ αὐτῶι
παρὰ μ(ὲν) Ἥ̣ρ̣α̣[ς] τυραννίδο(ς)
ἀκινήτου, π̣α̣[ρ]ὰ δ' Ἀθηνᾶς
εὐψυχί(ας) κ(α)τ(ὰ) πόλεμο(ν), τῆς
δ' Ἀφροδί(της) κάλλιςτό(ν) τε κ(αὶ)
ἐ̣πέραςτον αὐτὸν ὑπ̣ά̣ρ-
χειν, κρίνει ταύτην ν̣ικᾶν.
μ(ε)τ(ὰ) δ(ὲ) ταῦ(τα) πλεύςας εἰς
Λακεδαίμο(να) (καὶ) τὴν Ἑλένην

ἐξαγαγὼν ἐπανέρχεṭ(αι)
εἰς τὴν Ἴδην. ἀκού(ει) δ(ὲ) με-
τ' ὀλίγον τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς πυρ-
πολ]ε̣ῖ̣ν̣ τὴν χώ̣(ραν) (καὶ) [

8 *π(ερὶ) τῶν ποιη(τῶν)* Körte ap. ed. pr., Luppe (1988) : *π(ερὶ) ὑῶν ποιή(σεως)* Handley, Kassel-Austin || 13 supplemented in various ways || 16 *ευφυχ'* : *ευφυκ'* Kassel-Austin in crit. app., corr. into *εὐψυχ(ίας)* Austin : *εὐτυχί(ας)* ed. pr. || 25 [*ζητεῖν* suppl. Austin

Col. II

ΔΙΟ̅ΝΥΣ[ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
Η̅ [
ΚΡΑΤ[ΕΙΝΟΥ

τὸν Ἀλέξαν̣[δ(ρον). τὴν μ(ὲν) οὖν Ἑλένη(ν)
εἰς τάλαρον ὡς τ ̣ [
κρύψας, ἑαυτὸν δ' εἰς κριὸ[ν
μ(ε)τ(α)σκευάσας ὑπομένει
τ̲ὸ̲ μέλλον˙ παραγενό-
μενος δ' Ἀλέξανδ(ρος) κ(αὶ) φωρά-
σας ἑκάτερο(ν) ἄγειν ἐπὶ τὰς
ναῦς πρ(οσ)τάττει ὡς παραδώσων
τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖ(ς). ὀκνούσης δ(ὲ) τῆς
Ἑλένη(ς) ταύτην μ(ὲν) οἰκτείρας
ὡς γυναῖχ' ἕξων ἐπικατέχ(ει),
τὸν δ(ὲ) Διόνυ(σον) ὡς παραδοθη-
σόμενο(ν) ἀποστέλλει, συν-
ακολουθ(οῦσι) δ' οἱ σάτυ(ροι) παρακαλοῦν-
τές τε κ(αὶ) οὐκ ἂν προδώσειν
α̲ὐ̲τὸν φάσκοντες. κωμῳ-
δεῖται δ' ἐν τῷ δράματι Πε-
ρικλῆς μάλα πιθανῶς δι'
ἐμφάσεως ὡς ἐπαγηοχὼς
τ̲ο̲ῖ̲ς̲ Ἀθηναίοις τὸν πόλεμον.

29 suppl. ed. pr. (*οὖν* Austin) || 30 *ὡς τά̣[χιστα* Luppe || 32 *ὑπο-* || 33 *μελ-λον˙ πα-* || 41 *-λει συν-* || 44 *-τες κω-* || 47 *επαγει-* corr. vLeeuwen *Mnem.* 32, 1904, 446

23 *P.Oxy.* 31, 2534 Oxyrhynchus, I

ed. pr. J.W.B. Barns-R.A. Coles, *CQ* ns. 15, 1965, 55-57 = J.W.B. Barns, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 31, London 1966, 12-13
re-ed. by Austin, *CGFPR* 202 + 111 (p. 195 and 128)
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp.* to Men. unknown play, *Heauton Timorumenus*

μ]ητέρα χήρ̣α̣[ν
. .]ωι τὸ χρυϲ̣[ίον
βων ταυτ̣[
πρόϲοδον ε̣[
τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα̣[

B̄ Αὑτὸν [τιμωρούμενοϲ
[οὗ ἀρχή·
βραχ[
τε γεγο̣ν̣[
αι ἐποιήθ[η
ταύτηϲ ζη[τ
ϲιϲ καὶ τὰ κα . [
περὶ πρεϲβυ̣[τ
νουθετῶν τ̣[
μετερωμεν[
αὐτὸν ο̣υ̣τ . [
. αθ̣ . . . [
. ι̣την . [
. . . . .

5 one dot below τ, prob. the end of a paragraphus || **11** τρ\αυ/⟦ι⟧τηϲ (α written above ρ without cancellation)

24 *P.IFAO* inv. 337 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. B. Boyaval, *ZPE* 6, 1970, 5-7 + pl. IIa
re-ed. by Austin, *CGFPR* 203 + 119 (p. 195-196 and 131)

Contents: *hypp.* to Men. *Demiurgus?* and *Dis exapaton*

]̣ παν εἰcιὼ̣ν ἐλευθέρωc ο̣[
̣]ωτοc διακονῶν ἑτοιμ[πρά-
γματα χωρὶc θ[ε]ράποντ̣[οc
κ̣αὶ πρεcβύταc χρηcτοὺc [θρα-
c̣εῖαν μέν, οὐ πονηρὰν δ[έ
τοῦτο δυεῖν ἡμερῶν χρόν̣[ον
Δὶc ἐξαπατῶν ο[ὖ ἀρχή·
πρὸc τῶν θεῶν μειράκιο[ν
]̣ [ ]̣ []c̣[
. . . .

1 *ιcιω̣ν* | ο̣[ed. pr. : I discern on the plate left side of round curve, ο̣, c̣ or ω̣? || **8** *μιρ-* || **9** c̣[ed. pr. : I discern on the plate only the top of a curve

25 *P.Oxy.* 60, 4020 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. P.J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 60, London 1994, 27-29 + pl. III
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp.* to Men. *Epitrepontes*

Ε̣ ̣ [
Ἐπιτρέ̣[ποντεc
οὐχ ὁ τ⌊ρόφι-
μόc cο⌊ν, πρὸc
θεῶν

τὸ δρᾶμα τῶν ἀ[ρίcτων
περιγέγονεν τ̣α[
ἠθῶν ἁ̣πάντων [
δύο, τὸν μὲν cωφ[ρόνωc
δ' αἰcχυνομένω[c
γ]αμετὴν κοcμίω[c
ἑ̣ταίραν ἀφελῶc ̣ [
φιλάργυρον λογιcμ[
θ]ε̣ρ̣άποντα δ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ [
. . . .

7 *τ̣* or perhaps *γ* || **12** ̣ [, prob. *π*

26 *P.Oxy.* 10, 1235 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhychus Papyri* 10, London 1914, 81-88; cf. *GMAW* pl. 44
re-ed. by F.H. Sandbach, *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae*, Oxford 1972 (= 1990) 305-306
cf. Pack 1321; Austin, *CGFPR* 154-156 (p. 165, no text); M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 93, 1992, 20ff.; W. Luppe, *ZPE* 96, 1993, 9-10 (both on ll. 106-111)
* my observations are based on inspection of a photograph in Oxford

Contents: *hypp.* to Men. unknown play, *Iereia, Imbrioi*

Col. I

. . . .
]α
]λεν
]ροc
]μ̣ει
] .
]
]τ̣ον
]ι̣χα
]ε̣λι
]cω
]ε̣ται
]ινο
]
Ἱέρεια, ἧc ἀρχή·]
]ο̣ρε
]α̣ α
]ειν
]ν̣α̣
]ι̣
]
ἡ δ' ὑπόθεcιc·]
]ε
]κυ
]αι
]δ̣ιε
]ηι
]α̣
]ε̣ιc
]ο̣
]ε̣
] . .

5 top of curve :]c ed. pr. || *7* sic ed. pr. : I do not discern τ̣ || **8**]ι̣ ed. pr. : upright || **16**]α̣ or]δ̣ ? || **19**]ι̣ ed. pr. : upright || *27*]α̣ ed. pr. : or]λ̣ ? || **28**]ειc ed. pr. : or]ηc ? || **29**]ο̣ ed. pr. : right side of curve || **30**]ε̣ ed. pr. : or]c̣ ?

Col. II

. . . .]ι̣τ[. . . . .]λυcα-
. . . .]ετ . [. . . .]ν̣ καὶ
. . . . .]ο̣ν. ἡ δ' ἱέρ̣[εια πο]λὺ μὲν
. . . . .]ηc̣εν τὸν c[. . .] . ουν
. . . .]κ̣ατώρ̣υξεν ο̣[. . .] . cη

. . . .]νῆλθον οἱ πα[ῖδε]ϲ· ὁ δὲ τὸ πρ]ότερον γε[νό]μενοϲ . . . . . .]αϲ ἀνὴρ ν . [. .]αϲ πα- . . . .]επιϲκεπτ[ομ]ένηϲ . . . .]δοϲ πα[. . . .]ϲαϲ . . . .] . [.]ϲ . [. . . . .]α . . . . ἀν]αϲφῆλαϲ ζητεῖν ἐπε]χείρηϲεν τὸν ἀγαπητόν. οἰκέτηϲ δὲ πειϲθεὶϲ ἠνέχθη πρὸϲ τὴν ἱέρειαν ὡϲ θεοφορούμενοϲ θεραπείαϲ ἵνα ἀξιωθῇ λάθραι· τὴν δ' ἀλήθειαν πεπειϲμένοϲ ἐξίχνευϲεν. ὁ δὲ τῆϲ ὑποβεβλημένηϲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆ[ϲ] γνήϲιοϲ μειρακίϲκοϲ τὴν τῆϲ ἱερείαϲ θυγατέρα γῆμαι προαιρούμενοϲ εἰϲέπεμψε τὴν μητέρα διαλεξομένην πρὸϲ τὴν ἱέ[ρ]ειαν περὶ αὐτοῦ. λαλουϲῶν δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν ὑποψίαν λαβὼν καὶ μάλιϲθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ θεράποντοϲ διδαχθεὶϲ προϲώπωι διαλλάττων, τὸν νεώτερον τῶν γειτόνων υἱὸν ὡϲ ἑαυτοῦ> προϲφωνεῖ. γνοὺϲ δ' ἐκεῖνοϲ αὐτοῦ τὸ διαμάρτημα τὸν ἀδελφὸν προδιαϲείει, λέγων μεμανηκέναι τὸν πρεϲβύτην καὶ πάνταϲ τοὺϲ νέουϲ υἱοὺϲ ἀποφαίνειν αὐτοῦ· διὸ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξετάϲαντοϲ τοῦ γέροντοϲ καὶ τὸν πρεϲβύ[τερον] προϲφωνοῦντοϲ υἱὸ[ν ὡ]ϲ μαινόμενον ἐκεῖ[νοϲ ἀπο]πέμπει· ἅμα δ' ὁ τ[. . . . .]ϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θερά[ποντοϲ

32 sic ed. pr. : I do not discern -*cα* || 34 *ον η* || 35] . , ε̣ (ed. pr.), κ̣ or c̣ ? || 42]α̣ ed. pr., or]λ ? || 48 λαθραι *την* || 49 *εξειχ-* || 61 λάττειν corr. Wilamowitz || 62 *γιτονωννον* || 63 *-νει γν-* || 66 *μεμενηκε* : corr. Wilamowitz || 69 *-του διο* || 73 *-τοc* corr. from *-ταc* | *νον* || 75 *πει αμα* |]c̣ ed. pr. : I discern one dot

Col. III

πο . [
ταṭ[. . . . . .]ωṭ[
μη[. . . . . . .]ερω[
ανι̣[. . . . . .] . γαμ[
παγ[. . .]μ̣ενοc α[
απα[. . . .]περιδ[
κον[. . . . .]ων δει̣[
ελθ̣[. . . . .] ὁ̣ μὲν π[ρεcβύτηc
τὸν υ̣[ἱὸν ἀπ]ο̣λαβὼ̣[ν γαμεῖ
τὴν [ἱ]ε̣[ρειαν, ὁ δὲ υἱὸc αὐτοῦ
λαμβάν[ει τὴν θυγατέρα τῶν
θρεψάν[των, ὁ δὲ νεώτεροc
καὶ γνήc[ιοc τῶν γειτόνων
υἱὸc λαμ̣[βάν]ει τὴν [τῆc ἱερεί-
αc, ἣν ἠγάπηcεν, κα[ὶ ποιοῦν-
ται γάμοι τῶν τριῶν[
ἔρωc προυξένηcε ε̣ι̣δ̣[
τ̱ων διδόντων ονδ[
τὰ [μ]ὲν̣ [οὖν] τῆc ὑποθ̣[έcεώc
ἐc[τι ταῦτα˙] τὸ δὲ δ[ρᾶμα τῶν
ἀ[ρίcτων˙ ἔχ]ει δὲ πρ̣[εcβύτην
ευ̣[. . . . .]ν νεαν . [
φι[. . . . . .]υ̣c οἰκέτη[ν
λο[. . . . . .]ν καὶ παν[
ε̣ . [. . . ἐ]π̣ὶ πᾶcιν καὶ τ̣[
τ̱ο̣[υ] π̣αραφωνηc̣[ ]νπρ[
Ἴμβριοι ὧν ἀρχή˙[
Δι' ὅcου χρόνου cε, Δημέα̣ τ̣[
***βέλτιcτ', ἐγώ.** ταύτην [ἔγρα-*
ψεν ἐπὶ Νικοκλέο[υc
την καὶ ἑβδομηκοcτ̣[ὴν καὶ
ἔδωκεν εἰc ἐργαcίαν [εἰc (τὰ)
Διονύcια, οὐκ ἐγένετο δ[ὲ διὰ
Λαχάρην τὸν τύραννο̣[ν˙ ἔπ

τα ὑπεκρίνετο Κάλ̣[λιπ-
πος Ἀθηναῖος. [
ἡ δ' ὑπόθεσις'[
δύο πένητες ἀλλήλω̣[ν φί-
λοι κοινὸν ποιησάμεν̣[οι τὸν
βίον Ἴμβρον ᾤκησαν κ̣[αὶ
διδύμας ἀδελφὰς ἔγη[μαν
κοινοποιησάμενοι π̣[ᾶσαν
ἅμα καὶ τὴν ὕπαρξιν. φ[ιλο-
πόνως δὲ καὶ κατὰ γῆν [καὶ
κατὰ θάλατταν ἐργα̣ζ[όμε-

80 and 83 ι̣[ed. pr. : upright || 98 νεαν ν̣[ed. pr. : νεανί[σκους Sandbach (both readings seem possible on the photograph) || 102 το̣[ν] or τω̣[ι] ed. pr. || 103 ιμβριοι ων || 104 δημε\α̣/ || 105 after εγω small space with possible high stop || 106 νεικο- || 110 τυραννή̣[σαντα Gronewald : τυραννε̣[ύοντα Luppe || 111 υπεκρεινετο : -νατο ed. pr. || 112 αθηναιος⟦η⟧

Unplaced fragments

1

. . .
]την δε̣[
]κ̣ακαι ο̣[
] . υπετε̣[
]ο̣[
. . .

2

. .
]θ̣εις[
]νειν̣[
]τ̣ην̣[
. .

3

. .
] . [
]π̣οντ̣[
. .

Fr. 1, 2 sic ed. pr. : I see only dots instead of κ and ο || 3-4 sic ed. pr., I cannot discern letters

27 *P.Bodm.* 4 Panopolis?, III-IV

ed. pr. V. Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer. Ménandre: Le Dyscolos*, 4, Cologny/Genève 1958 + pl. 1; cf. Seider (1970) 51a + pl. 26
re-ed. by F.H. Sandbach, *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae*, Oxford 1972 (= 1990), 44-46
cf. Pack 1298; Austin, *CGFPR* 123 (= p. 133, no text)
* the text is based on the re-edition; I refer the reader to that crit. app. for the readings. The layout and my own remarks are based on the published photographs.

Contents: metrical *hyp.* to Men. *Dyscolus*

ιθ

ΑΡΙCΤΟΦΑΝ(ΟΥC) ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙ(ΚΟΥ) Η ΥΠΟΘΕCΙC

ἔχων θυγατέρα δύcκολοc, μητρὸc μέν, ἣν
ἔγημ' ἔχουcαν υἱόν, ἀπελείφθη τάχοc
διὰ τοὺc τρόπουc, μόνοc δ' ἐπ' ἀγρῶν διετέλει.
τῆc παρθένου δὲ Cώcτρατοc cφοδρῶc ἐρῶν
προcῆλθεν αἰτῶν· ἀντέπιφθ' ὁ δύcκολοc.
τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτῆc ἔπιθεν· οὐκ εἶχ' ὅ τι λέγοι
ἐκεῖνοc. ἐμπεcὼν δὲ Κνήμων εἰc φρέαρ
τὸν Cώcτρατον βοηθὸν εἶχε διὰ τάχουc.
κατηλλάγη μὲν τῇ γυναικί, τὴν κόρην
τούτῳ δ' ἐδίδου γυναῖκα κατὰ νόμουc ἑκών.
τούτου δ' ἀδελφὴν λαμβάνει τῷ Γοργίαι
τῷ τῆc γυναικὸc παιδί, πρᾶοc γενόμενοc.

— — — — — —

ἐδίδαξεν εἰc Λήναια ἐπὶ Δημογένουc ἄρχοντ(οc)
καὶ ἐνίκα. ὑπεκρίνατο Ἀριcτόδημοc Cκαφεύc.
ἀντεπιγράφετ(αι) Μιcάνθρωποc.

τὰ τοῦ δράματ(οc) πρόcωπα·		Δᾶοc
Πάν	ὁ θεόc	Γοργίαc ὁ ἐκ
		μ[η]τρὸc ἀδελφ[όc
Χαιρέαc	ὁ παράcιτοc	Cίκων μάγειροc
Cώcτρατοc	ὁ ἐραcθείc	Γέταc ὁ δοῦλο[c
Πυρρίαc	ὁ δοῦλοc	Cιμίκη γραῦc
Κνήμων	ὁ πατήρ	Καλλιππίδηc π[α-
παρθένοc θυγάτηρ Κνήμων(οc)		τὴρ τοῦ Cωcτράτ[ου

1 *μονην* || 2 *ετημεν* | *υιον·* || 3 *μονο*⟦*υ*⟧*cδ'* | *διετελει·* || 5 *αιτων·αντεπιφθ'οδυcκολοc·* || 6 *ο* in -*φον* corr. from *η* | *επειθεν·ουκειχ'οτιποει·* and in the margin *λεγοι* || 7 *εκεινοc·* | *φρεαρ·* || 8 *ταχουc·* || 9 *κατ'ηλλαγηι* | *γυναικι·* || 10 *δ'* | *τηνγυναικα* | *ερων·* : *ἐρᾶν* ed. pr. || 11 *τουτωδ'* || 13 *διδυμογενηc* || 14 *ενικα·* || 15 *αντιεπι-* || 16 *δαοc* ⟦*αδελ*⟧ || 17 *παν*⟦*θεοc*⟧ | *τροcαδελφοc* written between l. 17 and 18 || 19 ⟦*β*⟧*cω-* || 20 *απυρ-*

28 *P.Cair.* inv. 43227 Aphroditopolis, IV-V

ed. pr. M.G. Lefebvre, *Fragments d'un manuscrit de Ménandre*, Le Caire 1907, esp. 3-19; cf. pl. I in: H. Riad/Abd el-Kadr Selim, *The Cairo Codex of Menander: a photographic edition*, (preface by L. Koenen), Ilkley 1978
re-ed. by F.H. Sandbach, *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae*, Oxford 1972 (= 1990), 132-139
cf. Pack 1301; Austin, *CGFPR* 139 (= p. 139, no text)

Contents: metrical *hyp.* to Men. *Heros*

κθ
῞Ηρωc Μ]ενάνδρου

῎Αρρεν τεκοῦcα παρθένοc θῆλύ θ' ἅμα
ἔδωκεν ἐπιτρόπῳ τρέφειν, εἶθ' ὕcτερον
ἔγημε τὸν φθείραντα· ταῦτα δ' ὑπέθετο
ὁ τρέφων πρὸc αὐτὸν ἀγνοῶν. θεράπων δέ τιc
ἐνέπεcεν εἰc ἔρωτα τῆc νεανίδοc
ὁμόδουλον εἶναι διαλαβών. γείτων δέ τιc
προηδικήκει μετὰ βίαc τὴν μείρακα.
τὴν αἰτίαν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ θεράπων cτρέφειν
ἐβούλετ', οὐκ εἰδυῖα δ' ἡ μήτηρ ἄγαν
ἐδυcχέραινε. καταφανῶν δὲ γενομένων
εὗρεν μὲν ὁ γέρων τοὺc ἑαυτοῦ γνωρίcαc,
ὁ δ' ἠδικηκὼc ἔλαβε τὴν κόρην θέλων.
\- - - - - - -

τὰ τοῦ δράμ(ατοc) πρόcωπα·

Γέταc	Cωφρόνη
Δᾶοc	Cαγγάριοc
῞Ηρωc, θεόc	Γοργίαc
Μυρρίνη	Λάχηc
Φειδίαc	

1 ᾱρρεν | θ' | ῎Αρρεν ⟨τε⟩ θῆλύ θ' ἅμα τεκοῦcα παρθένοc corr. Wilamowitz || 2 -τροφωτρεφειν·ειθ'ϋc- || 3 -τα·ταυταδ'ϋπ- || 4 αγνοων· || 6 -λαβων· || 9 εβουλετ' | δ' η || 12 ο δ' || 19 the list of characters is immediately followed by the text of the play.

29 *P.Achm.* 2 Panopolis, III-IV

ed. pr. U. Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte der (Königlich-) Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Berlin 1887, 817-818
re-ed. by P. Collart, *Les Papyrus grecs d'Achmîm à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*, Cairo 1930, 5-9
cf. Pack 1159; U. von Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 23, 1888, 142ff.
* text based on re-edition

Contents: *hyp. Iliad* 1 (ll. 21-36 glossary of same book not printed)

α̅

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος. Ἀγαμέμνων αἰχμάλωτον ἔχων παλλακίδα ἱερέως Ἀπόλλωνος Χρύσου θυγατέρα Χρυσηΐδα οὐκ ἀπέδωκεν δεομένῳ λυτρώσασθαι τῷ πατρί· διόπερ λοιμὸς κατέσχεν τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπ' ἐννέα ἡμέρας μηνίσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἕως Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐπέγνω τὴν αἰτίαν Κάλχαντος μαντευσαμένου. Καὶ Ἀγαμέμνων μὲν πρότερον ἐπὶ τῇ μαντείᾳ λοιδορησάμενος Κάλχαντι τὴν μὲν Χρυσηΐδα ἀπέδωκε τῷ πατρί, τὴν δὲ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ· τὴν δὲ Ἀχιλλέως ἀφείλατο Βρισηΐδα. Καὶ Ἀχιλλε[ὺς μὲν τῆς μητρὸς ἐδεήθη Θέτιδος ὅπως αὐτῷ βοηθήσῃ· ἡ δὲ παρεκάλεσε τὸν Δία ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας ἥκοντα ἐλα[τ]τῶσαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐν τῇ μάχῃ· Ἥρα δὲ ἐπὶ τούτῳ διηνέχθη πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ νὺξ ἐγένετο γέλωτα παρὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν εὐωχίαν παρασχόντ[ο]ς Ἡφαίστου. — Περιέχει δὲ ἡ ῥαψῳδία ἡμέρας κα —
glossary

4 ϊερεωc || 5 χρυcηϊδα || 8 θυ̅ || 11 χρυcηϊδα || 12 απεδωκε \τω/ | θω̅ || 13 βριcηϊδα || 15 ἤδε ed.pr. || 16 ηκονταc || 17 επει || 19 θω̅ν ευωχειαν

30 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3829 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. L. Käppel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 56, London 1989, 30-37 + pl. IV
cf. W. Luppe, *Gnomon* 64, 1991, 291 (with supplements to col. III)
* inspexi

Contents: catechism, *antehomerica*, *hyp. Iliad* 1

Col. I: "only a few final letters which are not worth transcribing"
Col. II

Ἕκτωρ. τ[ίν]ε[ϲ ϲύ]μβουλοι;
Πουλυδά[μ]ᾳϲ καὶ [Ἀ]ντήνωρ.
τίνεϲ̣ κήρυκεϲ; [Ἰδ]α̣ῖ̣οϲ κα[ὶ
Εὐμήδηϲ̣ ὁ Δόλ[ωνοϲ] πατή[ρ,
ἴϲωϲ [δ]ὲ καὶ ὁ Δ[όλω]ν. τίνεϲ
μάντειϲ; Ἕλ[ενοϲ] καὶ Κα̣ϲϲάν-
δρ̣α Πρ̣ιάμου πα̣ῖδεϲ. τῆϲ Ὁμή-
ρου Ἰλιάδοϲ ἡ ἐξ ἀρχῆϲ ὑπόθεϲιϲ·
ὁ Ζεὺϲ ἀϲέβειαν καταγνοὺϲ τοῦ
ἡρωϊκοῦ γένουϲ βουλεύεται
μετὰ Θέμιδοϲ ἄρδην αὐτοὺϲ ἀ-
πολέϲαι. θύων δὲ ἐν τῷ Πηλίῳ
ὄρει παρὰ Χείρωνι τῷ Κενταύρῳ
τοὺϲ Θέτιδοϲ καὶ Πηλέωϲ γάμουϲ,
τοὺϲ μὲν ἄλλουϲ θεοὺϲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑϲτί-
α̣ν παρεκάλε̣ι̣, μόνην δὲ τὴν Ἔριν
εἰϲϊοῦϲαν̣ Ἑρ̣μῆϲ κωλύει Διὸϲ κελεύ-
ϲα̣ν̣τοϲ. ἡ δ̣ὲ ὀ̣ργ̣ιϲθεῖϲα χρυϲοῦν
μῆλον πρ̣ο̣[ϲ]έρριψεν τῷ ϲυμποϲίῳ,
ὑπὲρ οὗ φιλονικίαϲ γενομένηϲ
Ἥ̣ραϲ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶϲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτηϲ, ὁ Ζεὺϲ
ἔπαθλον προὔθηκεν τῇ καλλίϲτῃ

3 ε[ιδ]α̣ιοϲ ‖ 5 ϊϲωϲ ‖ 7 παιδεϲ· ‖ 8 -ϲιϲ· ‖ 10 ηρωϊ- ‖ 11 μετα⟦θ⟧\θ/ ‖ 12 πηλειω ‖ 16 ερειν ‖ 17 ειϲϊου- ‖ 18 -τοϲ· ‖ 19 -ερρειψεν ‖ 20 υπ⟦ε⟧-\ε/ρ⟦ο⟧\ο/ | φιλονεικιαϲ ‖ 21 αφροδειτηϲ ‖ 22 -θηκε⟦ν⟧\ν/

Col. III

φαν[
Ἀλεξ[
.[..]ξ[
..]το[
ωνδι[
τωτ.[
ϲχνο[
Ἀϲία[
δετη[ἐπαγ-

γελλο . [13 πολέ-
μοις . [
τὴν ᾿Α[φροδίτην
τωτο[
καὶ λη[
δε γυ . [
"Ηρα· κα[
μῆνι⌊ν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω ᾿Αχιλῆος·
᾿Αγαμέμ⌊νων αἰχμάλωτον ἔχων
παλλακ⌊ίδα, ἱερέως ᾿Απόλλωνος
Χρύσο⌊υ θυγατέρα, Χρυσηΐδα,
οὐκ ἀπ⌊έδωκεν δεομένῳ λυ-
τρώσας⌊θαι τῷ πατρί· διόπερ

38 ηρα· || 39 μ[[.]]ηνι || 40-44 supplem. according to pap. 29

31 *P.Bon.* 1, 6 ?, III-IV

ed. pr. O. Montevecchi, *Papyri Bononienses*, Milano 1953, 28-29 (cf. preliminary ed. by Montevecchi in *Aegyptus* 27, 1947, 173)
re-ed. by F. Montanari, *Anagennesis* 2, 1982, 273-284 + pl. III (= Montanari 1995 *Studi*: 87-95)
cf. Cribiore (1996: no. 352)
* text printed according to re-ed. Montanari

Contents: *hyp. Iliad* 1

. . . . . .
. . .] . . ω . . . κα .()[
ἀπο]πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ
τ[οῦ ᾿Α]γαμέμνονος
ηὔξατο τῷ ᾿Απόλλω-
νι δετιμωρησειν
τεαυτω. ὁ δὲ θεὸς
ἐπακούσας λ[οιμ]ὸν
ἐπέσκηψεν τοῖς
᾿Αχαιοῖς, ὑφ᾿ οὗ κα-
κούμενοι κατέφυ-
γον εἰς τὸν μάν-

2]πεμπτεις || 4 ευξατο || 5-6 δ' ἐτιμώρησεν | τε αὐτῷ. ed. pr. : {δε} τιμωρήσε(ι)ν | {τ} ἑαυτῷ Merkelbach ap. ed. pr.

32 *P.Pis.* inv. 1 ?, VI

ed. pr. M. Lallai, in *Nuovi Papiri Letterari Fiorentini presentati al XIII Papyr. Kongr. Marburg 1971*, ed. A. Carlini, Pisa 1971, 27-28
re-ed. by A. Carlini, *Papiri letterari greci*, Pisa 1978, 163-164 + pl. IX
cf. F. Montanari, *Anagennesis* 2, 1982, 273-284 + pl. II (= Montanari 1995 *Studi*: 87-95); Cribiore (1996: no. 356)
* text according to Montanari

Contents: *hyp. Iliad* 3

. . . . . .
] . . . κ̣οιμᾶτ[αι
᾿Α]γαμέμ[νων δ]ὲ διὰ τῶ(ν)
ὅρ]κων . [. . . .()]᾿Ε̣λ̣έ[ν-
ἀ]παιτεῖ . [
᾿Α]λεξάνδρου καὶ Μενελάου μονομαχία¯

2 τω̄ || 3 ᾿Ε̣λ̣έ[ν- based on Montanari comm. p. 276 whereas he prints] . λ̣ε[in the text || 5 -μαχία(ν) Montanari, but cf. my comm.

33 *P.Oxy.* 44, 3159 Oxyrhynchus, III

ed. pr. M.W. Haslam, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 44, London 1976, 50-52
cf. Cribiore (1996: no. 336 + pl. L)
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp.* (ll. 1-7) and glossary *Iliad* 7 (not printed)

Col. I

]ηθενταεπιτηκα	λυπ]ηθέντα ἐπὶ τῇ κα-
] . ουελληνικου	τασκευῇ] τ̣οῦ ῾Ελληνικοῦ
]ζευϲκαταπραϋ	τείχουϲ] Ζεὺϲ καταπραΰ-
]οϲχομ̣ενοϲαυ	νει ὑπ]οϲχόμενοϲ αὐ-
] . [.]εϲπ̣οι . ϲαι	τὸ καὶ ἐξ]ῶ̣[λ]εϲ ποιῆϲαι
] . ητουπολ̣εμου	καὶ τὰ πά]θ̣η τοῦ πολέμου
]υϲιν	προδείκν]υϲιν.

Both transcripts are printed as offered by Haslam who writes "The above restoration is offered exempli gratia; the lines may have been longer. Line 5 is probably wrong." || 5]ω̣[very uncertain

34 *P.Mich.* inv. 920a,b + 921 ?, II-III

ed. pr. J.J. O'Hara, *ZPE* 56, 1984, 1-9 + pl. Ia,b

Contents: *hypp. Iliad* 7 and 8

Fr. 920a, b

]c̣των Ἑλλήνων
]α̣ι̣ αὐτῶι μονομαχῆ-
cαι, οἱ δὲ Ἀχαιο]ὶ̣ πρότερον ἐcίγων
. . . . Νέcτωρ αὐτο]ὺc παρακαλεῖ καὶ ἐγ̣εί-
ρει] . ον πρῶτοc Ἀγαμέμνων
ἀνίcτ]α̣τ̣ο καὶ Διομήδηc καὶ
καὶ] Ἰδομενεὺc ο̣ἱ̣ Κ̣ρῆτεc̣
καὶ Θόαc καὶ Ε]ὐρύπυλοc καὶ Ὀδυccεύc.
] Νέcτωρ καὶ λαγχά̣ν̣ε̣ι̣
Αἴαc ὁ Τελαμώνιο]c̣. οἱ δὲ προελθ̣ό̣ντεc
μάχονται, καὶ νι]κᾳ̣̃ ὁ Αἴαc. οἱ δὲ
κήρυκεc [αὐτο]ὺ̣c [διέλυcαν] καὶ ἡ νὺξ
ἐν ᾗ οἱ Ἀχ[αιοὶ τὸ] τεῖχο[c] π̣ρ̣ὸ̣ τῶν̣ ν̣ηῶν
ἐποίηcα[ν] κ̣α̣ὶ̣ τὴ[ν] τάφρον ὤρυξαν·
τοὺc δὲ νεκροὺc ἀνελ[ό]μενοι θάπτουc̣[ι.
νῆεc δ' ἐκ Λήμνου π̣[αρα]γίνονται οἶ-
νον ἄγουcαι εἰc τὸ cτρατό̣π̣ε̣δον εἰc [τὸ
ἀγοράcα̣ι. Ἀχαιοὶ οἰνίζονται· κ̣ο̣ι̣μ̣ή-
**cαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δ̣ῶρον
ἕλοντο.**

θῆτα

Ἠὼc **μὲν κροκόπεπλοc ἐκίδ̣ν̣ατο
π̣ᾶ̣c̣αν ἐπ' αἶαν.** πεδιὰc μάχη ἢ κολ̣ο̣β̣ὸ̣c̣
μάχη ἐ]ν ᾗ οἱ Ἀ̣[χ]αιοὶ ἐκθλιβῆν̣ τοῦ
. . . . .] . c̣ε̣π̣[. . .]ο̣ντοc καὶ ἐπι[
ὁ δ]ὲ̣ Νέcτω̣ρ̣ . . [

. . . .

3 εcειγων || 7 ειδομενευc || 10 Τελαμῶνο]c̣ ed. pr. : Τελαμώνιο]c̣, cf. med. *hyp.* || 16 π[αρα]γεινονται

Fr. 921

. . . .

. .] . . α̣ . . [ὁ Τεῦκροc τῇ

ἀριcτείᾳ καὶ πολλοὺc καταβά̣[λλει
τῶν Τρώων τόξωι βάλλ̣ω[ν· τοῦτον δὲ
Ἕκτωρ λίθωι βάλλει κατὰ [τοῦ ὤμου· αὐ-
τὸ̣ν δὲ cώζουcιν οἱ Αἴαντεc ἐπὶ τ̣ὰ̣[c ναῦc.
μάχηc δὲ γεναμένηc πολλοὺc̣ ὁ̣ [Ἕκτωρ
φονεύει ἀριcτεύων. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ̣ τὰc [ναῦc
ἀ]ποχωροῦcι, ἥ τε νὺξ διέλυcε τὴ[ν μάχην.
ο]ἱ δὲ βάρβαροι καὶ ὁ Ἕκτωρ ἐπαυλί̣[ζονται
τ]αῖc ναυcὶ̣ν πυρὰν τε καίουcιν ἐν τ̣ῶ̣[ι πε-
δί]ωι καὶ τοὺc ἵππουc κριθίζουcι̣ν· ⌊ἑcταό-
τε⌋c παρ' ὄχεcφιν ἐύθρονον ⌊Ἠῶ
μί⌋μνον.

38 ⟦α⟧ \ο/χεcφιν

35 *P.Oxy.* 3, 574 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, London 1903, 279 (only a brief description)
Identified and re-ed. by F. Montanari, *ZPE* 48, 1982, 89-92; cf. Pack 1193
* inspexi; text based on re-edition

Contents: *hyp. Iliad* 11

Πάτροκλον μαθηcόμενον τίc εἴη· ὁ δὲ ἐπι-
γνοὺc καὶ ἀπολυόμενοc τῆc παρατάξεωc Εὐρυ-
πύλῳ cυναντᾷ, ὃν κακῶc ἐκ τῆc πληγῆc ἔχοντα
ἀπαγαγὼν εἰc τὴν ἐκείνου cκηνὴν ἰᾶται.
τῆc Μ̄

. . . .

1-2 επι | γνωc, γ corr. from κ || 2 καὶ ἀπολυόμενοc should perhaps be emended in {καὶ} ἀπολυομένῳ || 3 καιωc : κακῶc coni. Merkelbach ap. Montanari | εχοντοc || 4 ειαται

36 *P.Mich.* inv. 1315 ?, II-III

ed. pr. A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 12, 1973, 23-30 + pl. IIa
cf. Pack 1190

Contents: *hypp. Iliad* 10-17

Col. I

ἄλλοι μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶ⌋ν ἀριστῆες Παναχαιῶν
17-20]ωσι καὶ α̣[.]λ̣ωναι . [.] . γὰρ
17-20] . [.] . κοινοβουλίαν ἐποιήσαν-
το 18]παρόρμησις ἐ̣[πὶ] τ̣ὴν μά-
χην 15]κ̣[.] . Διομήδης ἐπὶ κατασ-
κοπὴν πεμφθέντες καὶ ἀπο]κ̣τείναντες Δόλωνα ἀνερε̣-
15 τὸ]ν̣ τῶν Θρ̣ᾳκῶν ἡγεμ[ό]να Ῥῆσ-
ον 15]κας οὗ καὶ τοὺς ἵππους
17-20]με̣νοι χωρο[ῦσιν ἐπ]ὶ̣ τὸ ναύσ-
ταθμον. τῆς Λ] [ ]
Ἠὼς δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο⌋ ἐκ [τ]ῆς
]Ἀγαμέ-
] . ς τοῖς
Ἀ]γαμέμνο-
ἀνα]χώρησις
πλ]ηγέντο̣ς
]τ̣ος ὅπις . ο
] . αφως επι
]τ̣ωρ ἐπὶ τῇ
] . τὸν Ἀχιλλέα
]καὶ δεηθέντα
τῆς Μ]
ὣς ὁ μὲν ἐν κλισίῃσι Μενοιτίου ἄλκιμο⌋ς υἱός. τειχο-
μαχία 25]υ̣ γίνεται Σαρ-
πηδ- 22-25 τοῦ] τ̣ε̣ίχ̣ους τῶν
Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν Τρώων ἐπὶ τὰς ν]αῦς ὅρμησις. τῆς Ν
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ⌋ Ἕκτορα νηυσ⌊ὶ⌋ πέλασσε.
23 ἀ]μφοτέρων τε Αἰάντων

7 ρης corr. from ρηζ || 21 δεθεντα || 26 ν̓ || 27 νεσ[ι] || 28 τε ⟦κ⟧

Col. II

ἀριστεία καὶ Ποσειδῶνος βοήθεια μὴ ὑ-
ποπτεύσαντος Διός. τῆς Ξ
*Νέστορα δ' οὐκ ἔλαθεν ἰαχὴ πίνοντά πε-
ρ ἔμπης.* Διὸς κατακοίμησις ἐπὶ τ̣ῆ̣ς Ἴ̣δ̣ης
τῆς Ἥρας λαβούσης παρὰ Ἀφροδίτης τὸν κεσ-
τὸν ἱμάντα καὶ Ποσειδῶνος βοήθεια μὴ [ὀ]πτε-
ύσαντ[ο]ς Διός. τῆς Ο
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν.

Διὸc ἀπειλὴ πρὸc Ἥρα[ν] περ[ὶ] τῆc κατακοιμή[c]εωc
καὶ Ἕκτοροc ἐκπρεπῆc ἀριcτεία καὶ Αἴ[αντο]c
ἀνδραγαθία· πολλοὺc γὰρ ἀπώλεcε τοὺc [τὸ π]ῦρ
προφέρ[ο]νταc. τῆc Π
ὣc οἱ μὲν περὶ νηὸc ἐυccέλμοιο μάχοντο. Πα-
τρόκλου παρουcία πρὸc Ἀχιλλέα καὶ τῶν πε- Ἰλιάδοc
ρὶ τοὺc Ἕλληναc ἀτυχημάτων ἐξαρίθμηcιc κ- ἀπὸ α
αὶ δέηcιc ὅπωc προιὼ[ν] ἀμύνῃ. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆc Πρ- ἕωc ρ
ωτεcιλάου νεὼc καιομένηc ἔξοδοc Πατρόκλου ρ ρ ρ
μετὰ τῶν Μυρμιδόνων καὶ ἀριcτεία. ἀναιρεῖ μὲ-
ν οὖν Cαρπηδόνα καὶ πλείcτουc ἄλλουc τῶν διαcήμ-
ων. αὖθιc δ' ἐμπηδήcαc τοῖc ἀντιπάλοιc γυμνοῦ-
ται μὲν ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνοc καὶ ἀναιρεῖται πρότερον
μὲν ὑπὸ Εὐφόρβου δε[ύτ]ερον δὲ ὑπὸ Ἕκτοροc.
τῆc Ρ
οὐδ' ἔλαθ' Ἀτρέοc υἱὸν ἀρηι⌊ί⌋ φιλον Μενέλαον.
ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ μάχη ἐν ᾗ Μενέλαοc ἀναιρεῖ
Εὔφορβον καί τιναc τῶν προαιρουμένων ἐξελ-
κύcαι τὸ Πατρόκλο[υ] cῶμα. καὶ πολλοὺc Αἴαc φο-
νεύει γίνεταί τε ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πολλὰ πτώ-
ματα. καὶ Ἀντίλοχοc π[έ]μπεται ἀγγελῶν Ἀ-
χι[λ]λεῖ περὶ Πατρόκλου.

29 βοηθια || 30 δι⟦εα⟧\οc/ || 31 ελεθεν ϊαχη || 32 επει | ειδηc || 33 αφροδειτηc || 34 ποcειδονοc βοηθειαc || 35 δι⟦αα⟧\οc/ || 36 επι | εβειcαν || 37 απιλη || 38 αριcτια || 39 ανδραγαθεια || 41 νηεc | εϋcελμοιο || 42 τροκλοc || 44 προϊω[ν] || 45 ωταιcιλαου || 46 αρειcτεια | ανερει || 47 cαρπηδον || 49 τεμεν | -λωνιοc | ανερειται || 50 ευφροβου | ϋπο || 52 ελαδ || 53 αναι- corr. from ανε-

37 ostracon Upper Egypt, II

ed. pr. J.G. Milne, *JHS* 28, 1908, 129 XII, XIII and 43, 1923, 42-43
cf. Pack 2725; Cribiore (1996: no. 274)
* the following text is based on the *JHS* articles, but neither of them presents an official edition of the complete text.

Contents: summary or *hyp. Iliad* 20

. . . .
] . . cυν̣[
] . εντωοδ . [
] . ε . . . . . νε[
] . ε̣α . . εcτα . [
εἰc μὲν τ]ο̣ὺc Τρῶαc Ἄ̣[ρηc' Ἀπόλλων'
Ἄρτεμιc'] Λ̣ητώ' Ἀφρ[οδίτη' Ξάνθοc'
ἵcτανται] εἰc δὲ τοὺc Ἀ̣[χαιοὺc Ποcει-
δῶν' Ἥρα' Ἀθηνᾶ' [Ἥφαιcτοc'
Ἑρμῆc' καὶ γίνετ̣[αι
μαcια' Ἀχιλλεὺc [
προκαλεῖται τὸν εκ̣[
μαχεαν ον καὶ ἰδόντ̣[
μοc . ινοι . . . νενπ[
δὲ πείθει τὸν Αἰνείαν̣[
κ̣αὶ ὁ δὲ πειcθεὶc πορ . [
μα̣χουc . . δε Α̣ἰνει[
]εντοc . [
. . . .

2 ὄ || 3-4 text based on drawing in Milne 1923; cf. text 1908:]cεα̣ . . . ελθε[|] . cαν . εcται̣[|| 5-8 suppl. by Milne 1923 || 8 αθανα || 9 γειvετ̣[|| 11-12 perhaps Ἕκ[τορα εἰc μονο- | μαχ⟨ί⟩αν ? || 12 ϊδ- || 14 πειθη || 15 πει-θειc | . [, ε or θ || 17 . [, ε or θ

38 *P.Ant.* 2, 69 Antinoopolis, II-III

ed. pr. J.W.B. Barns-H. Zilliacus, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, 2, London 1960, 54-55 + pl. III
cf. Pack 1206
* inspexi

Contents: *hypp. Iliad* 22 and 23 (only citation of first line) and *Od.* 2 and 3 (only citation of first line)

→

. . . .
] . [ ] . [
π]ε̣ίθει τὸν Ἕκ̣[τορα
] . ι καὶ οὕτωc ἀναιρεῖται Ἕκτω[ρ
τὰ cφ]υρὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξάψ̣[αc] τ̣ο̣ῦ̣ . [

ο]ἱ δὲ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν [. . .]ατ[
]ητει:
Ψ̄
ὣς οἳ μὲ]ν στε⌊νάχοντο⌋ κ⌊ατὰ πτόλ⌋ιν· ⌊αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί,
] . . . [

. . . .

4 . [, ἅ[ρματος (ed. pr.) or perhaps δ[ίφρου (cf. App. Two, *Tab. Il. Cap.*)

↓

. . . .
] . [
Ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάν]η ῥοδοδάκτυλο⌊ς Ἠώς,
Τ]ηλέμαχος συνάγει τοὺς Ἰθα[κησίους
]γορευει τοῖς μνηστῆρσιν μη[
] . . [ ]εγουσιν ο δε μαρτυρα[
] . αν[.]α[. .] ἐυτρεπίζει τὰ περὶ τῆ[ς
] .
] Γ
Ἠέλιος δ' ἀνόρουσε, λιπ]ὼν ⌊περι⌋κ⌊αλλέα λίμ⌋νην,
] . . [ ] . . [

. . . .

9] . [om. ed. pr. : curved trace about 1.4 cm above λ || 14] . om. ed. pr. : dot below line, probably part of a descender || 18 second] . . [om. ed. pr. : high dot and top of a curve

39 *P.Oxy.* 44, 3160 + *P.Stras.* gr. 1401★ Oxyrhynchus, III

ed. pr. M.W. Haslam, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 44, London 1976, 52-57
★ *ed. pr.* J. Schwartz, *ZPE* 4, 1969, 175-176
combinated by W. Luppe, *ZPE* 27, 1977, 101-106 + pl. IV
cf. Mertens-Pack 1207.3 (pap. listed in Mertens, *CE* 60, 1985, 191-203); F. Montanari, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 31, 1981, 101-110 (= Montanari 1995 *Studi*: 103-111); Cribiore (1996: no. 335)
* inspexi *P.Oxy.* 3160

Contents: *hypp. Od.* 2 and 3 (not printed are: col. I with ends of lines; col. II beginning with 5 lines of a glossary to *Od.* 1; col. II end-beginning col. IV: glossary to *Od.* 2)

Col. II

δ[. . .]ρα̅
*ἦμος δ' ἠρ⌊ιγ⌋ένεια φάνη ⌊ῥοδ⌋ο-
δάκτυλος* 'Ηὼς — ἅμα ἡ[μέ-
ρ]ᾳ Τηλέμαχος τοὺς 'Ιθακ[ησίο]υς
ε]ἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγὼ[ν] κε-
λ]εύει ἐξιένα[ι] ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου α[ὐ]τοῦ.
μὴ πειςθέντων δὲ ἀποπλεῖ εἰς
Πύλον καὶ εἰς Λακεδαίμονα καὶ
πορευθεὶς πεύθεται περὶ τοῦ
πατρὸς καὶ εἰ μὲν ζῶντα
αὐτὸν πύθοιτο, ἀνέξαςθαι ἄλ-
λον ἐνιαυτόν, εἰ δὲ ἀποθανόντα,
κενοτάφιον αὐτῷ καταςκευ-
άςαι καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἀποπέμψαι
εἰς τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς 'Ικαρίου
οἶκον ὅπως αὐτὴν ἐκδώςει ᾧ
βούλεται. διαςκωφθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ
τῶν μνηςτήρων ἐπὶ τούτοις
συμπραττούςης 'Αθηνᾶς .
ναῦν καὶ ἐρέτας συναγαγὼν ἀποπλε[ῖ.
glossary

1 δ[. . .]ρα̅ read by A. Malnati who inspected the original; Luppe's suppl.]δ[ευτ]έρα seems possible ‖ 4 ϊθακ[‖ 6 εξϊεν- ‖ 10 ζωωντα ‖ 12 αποθανοτα ‖ 13 καινο- ‖ 15 ϊκαριου ‖ 16 ν in οικον corr. from υ ‖ 17 διαςκωπτεις | ϋπο ‖ 19 συνπρατ'τουςης | αθηνας is probably followed by a mark (not by a line-filler, as Haslam prints) to separate this line from \λε[ι/ ‖ 20 ναυ | αποπ\λε[ι/

Col. IV

πεῖ[ρε
'Ηέ⌊λι⌋ος δ' ἀνόρ⌊ουςε λιπὼν περικαλλέα λίμ⌊νην.
ἅμα ἡμέρᾳ Τηλ[έμαχος σὺν 'Αθη-
νᾷ κατάγει τῇ[Πύλῳ
. .] καταλαμβάν[
π[ά]ντας . . . . [
θύοντας καὶ[
παρ' αὐτῷ. πυν[θαν-
Τηλ[εμ]άχου α . [
'Οδυςςέως αὐ[

εἰδέναι φηϲὶν[
ε̣ἰ δὲ αὐτῷ εἰϲ Λ[ακεδαίμονα
πρὸϲ Μενέλαο[ν
εἴτε ἐπι̣ὶ νεὼϲ̣[
αλλα καὶ α . . . . [ὑπ-
ιϲχνεῖται . . . [

21 *πει̣̃[ρε* ed. pr. is paleographically preferable to *τ̣ρ̣(ε)ί̣[τη* Luppe || 25 sic ed. pr. : *κατάγο̣ν̣τα̣ι̣* [*εἰϲ Πύλον* Luppe : *ον* instead of *ει* possible, but *η*[preferable to *α*[|| 33 *ε̣ἰ* (ed. pr.) : perhaps *ϲ̣ι* (Luppe) || 36 *απολα*[suggested by ed. pr. : perhaps *απομ*[: *ἅρμα*[Luppe || 37 *ιϲχνιται*

40 *P.Ryl.* 1, 23 ?, II

ed. pr. A.S. Hunt, *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester* 1, Manchester 1911, 42-43
re-ed. by W. Luppe, *APF* 27, 1980, 33-35 + pl. 3; cf. Pack 1208
* text is based on re-edition (some readings were confirmed by D.M. Bain)

Contents: *hypp. Od.* 3 and 6

Col. I

. . . .

] . *α̣* . [
. . . . .()] . *τῆϲ ἐξ Ἰλίου ἀνακο̣μι-*
δῆϲ] τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν
τοῖϲ μν]ηϲτῆρϲιν διαπραϲϲο-
μένω]ν, ἔτι δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν . .
. . . .()]*ν καὶ προπομπὴ̣ν̣ Τ̣ηλε̣-*
μάχ]ου ε̣ἰ̣ϲ̣ Λακεδαίμονα πρὸϲ
. . . .()]*λ̣ . . ν.*

1]*λ̣α̣* . [ed. pr. || 2] . black dot : *νοϲτο]υ̣* ed. pr. : *περ]ὶ̣* Luppe || 2-3 *ανα-μ̣ε̣μν̣[η- | τ̣α̣ι̣* ed. pr. || 4 *μ̣[ν]η-* ed. pr. || 5-6 . . [.] | . . . . .]*ν* ed. pr. : *ε̣ὐ̣- | ω-χία]ν* Luppe || 6 *προπομπα̣ν* ed. pr. with comment "l. *προπομπην* or *προπομπιαν*." || 8 *των Πυ]λ̣ι̣ω̣ν* ed. pr. : *Μενέ]λ̣α̣ο̣ν* Luppe : after λ, Bain discerns a vertical trace which looks like the top of an *ι*

Col. II

. . . .

ὣϲ ὁ μὲν ἔνθα καθεῦδε πολύ-
τλαϲ δῖοϲ Ὀδυϲϲεύϲ· περιέχει

ὡc παρίcταται καθ' ὕπνουc 'Αθην̣[ᾶ] Να[υ-
cικάᾳ κελεύουcα ἅμ' ἡμέρᾳ ἐπ̣ὶ̣
τοὺc πλύνουc πορεύεcθαι κα[ὶ
ἱ]μάτια καθᾶραι Ναυcικάαc τ[ε ὁ-
μιλίαν πρὸc τὸν πατέρα 'Αλ-
κίνοον ὑπὲρ το̣ῦ̣ ἀ̣π̣ήνην α . [

11 παρ ιc- | \αθηνα/ || 15 μειλιαν || 16 αὐ̣[τῇ Luppe

41 *P.Laur.* 3, 53 ?, III

ed. pr. R. Pintaudi, *Dai Papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, 3, Firenze 1979, 25-27 (*Pap. Flor.* 5) + pl. LI
cf. Mertens-Pack 1209.4 (pap. listed in Mertens, *CE* 60, 1985, 191-203)

Contents: *hypp. Od.* 5 and 6

. . . .

τῆc] ε̣
'Ηὼc δ' ἐκ λεχ⌋έων παρ' ἀγ⌊αυ-
οῦ Τιθωνοῖ⌋ο̣. ἀχθείcηc [τῆc
'Αθηνᾶc ὁ 'Ερ]μ̣ῆc πρὸc Κ̣α̣[λυ-
ψὼ πέμπετ]αι ἀγγελία[ν
]π̣ο̣λυ . . ν . [
]αν ποιηcα[
] . . . α̣c̣α̣ν̣α̣[
]δ̣ . . ε̣ . . . [
] . . . . . . [
] . . . . c̣ω̣ . . [
τῆ]c ζ
ὣc ὁ μὲν ἔν⌋θ̣α καθεῦδ⌊ε, πολύ-
τλαc δῖοc⌋ 'Οδυccεύc. 'Α[θηνᾶ
Ναυcικάα τ]ῇ 'Αλκινόου [θυγα-
τρὶ] . . . . α̣ρ̣ . εc̣[
] . . ποιήcαc̣θ̣[αι
] . . . . [
] . . αν . . . [
] . [ ] . [

. . . .

42 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3833 Oxyrhynchus, IV

ed. pr. S.M. Goldberg, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 56, London 1989, 51-53
* inspexi

Contents: *hyp. Od.* 18 (not printed are: ↓ with glossary of *Od.* 17; end of → with glossary of *Od.* 18)

→

. . . .   κ[

τῆc c   [

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ πτωχὸc παν⌊δήμιοc, ὃc κα-
τὰ ἄcτυ   γεν[ο]μ̣έ[νηc τινοc μά-
χηc 'Οδυccέωc πρὸc [πτωχὸν ἐλθόν-
τ]α πρὸc τοὺc μνηcτῆρ[αc Πηνελόπη
λ̣αμβάνει δῶρα καὶ κ̣[οινολογία γίνεται
ἐ̣ν τοῖc ἑξῆc 'Οδυccέω[c πρὸc Εὐρύμαχον
περί τινοc ἄλλου τῶν[
glossary

3 δ'

43 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 1, 18 Tebtunis, I-II

ed. pr. M. Norsa-G. Vitelli, *Diegeseis di poemi di Callimaco in un papiro di Tebtynis*, Firenze 1934
re-ed. by A. Vogliano, *Papiri della R. Università di Milano* (PRIMI) 1, Milan 1937, 66-145 + pll. II, III; and R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, Oxford 1949-1953
cf. Pack 211; text of *Hecale* reprinted in Hollis (1990: 65 + comm. 135-136)
* text is based on re-edition Pfeiffer but I have also studied the photographs in the ed. of Vogliano

Contents: *diegeses* of *Aetia* books 3 and 4, *Iambi*, *Lyrica*, *Hecale* (cf. frr. 67-230); *Hymni* 1 and 2

Col. Z = Fr. A (Pf. p. 71)

]c παρθένου ἐκ
Κυδί]ππηc μήλῳ καλ-
λίcτωι . . . . 'μὰ τὴ]ν Ἄρτεμιν, 'Ακ

τίῳ γαμοῦμαι᾿ . . . .] . *ςεν ηδεηδε*
]*νετο᾿ ὡς δε* . *ε*
]*ηθει*[. .]*ιν* . . *ρω*
] . *γαμ*[
c. 35 lines lost
. . . .

Col. I (Pf. p. 71, 85-87, 91-92)
. . . .]*κ* . [. .]*μ* . *χ*[. . . . .] . [*π*]*ροχείρως πα-*
]
Εἶπ᾿ ἄγε μοι . . . [] . . . *α*[. . . . . .] . [] . . . . *αιῆνις*
Φ]*ηςὶν ἐν ῞Ηλιδι ε* . [ ] . . . . *ντ*[.] . [*γ*]*αμου-*
μένας παρθ[*ένους*] . . *ο*[. .] . *ου π*[*έ-*
πλους ἐχούςας ς[ ] . [. . . .]*ου*[
. .] *δόρυ δὲ ἐν*[
. *δε φηςιν α* . [
ἄνδρα καθωπ[*λιςμένον*

῾Ωφελες οὐλοὸν ἐγ[
]*εις ᾿Ιςίνδιον δ*[
] . *νπα*[
]*ςις*[
11 lines lost
. .] . [. .] . [
οιςφ[.] . *ια*[

Τεῦ δὲ χάριν [.]*ο* . [
κουςιν ᾿Εξῆ[ς] *φ*[*ηςι γυναῖκας δ*]*υς-*
τοκούςας τὴν ῞Αρτε[*μιν καίπερ ο*]*ὖ-*
ςαν παρθένον ἐπ[*ικαλεῖν, ὅτι* . .] . .
τη ἀπεκυήθη, ἢ ὅτι δ[*ιὰ ἐφημοςύ-*
νην τοῦ Διὸς ἡ Εἰ*λείθυια* [*αὐτὴν*] *τοῦ-*
τ᾿ ἔχειν ἔδωκεν ἐξ[*α*]*ίρετον, ἢ δι-*
ότι τὴν ἑαυτῆς μητ[*έρα ἐ*]*λύςατο*
τῶν ὠδίνων ὅτε ἀπέτικτεν
τὸν ᾿Απόλλωνα.

᾿Ηλθες ὅτ᾿ ἐκ Πίςης, Εὐθύκλεες, ἄν-
δρας ἐλέγξας Φη[ς]ὶν Εὐθυκλῆν
τὸν ᾿Ολυμπιονίκην, πεμφθέν-
τα πρεςβευτὴν καὶ ἀνακάμψαν-

τα οἴκαδε cὺν ἡμιόνοιc̣ ἃ εἰλήφει
δῶρα παρά τινοc ξένου, cυκο-
φαντηθῆναι ὡc κατὰ τῆc πόλε-
ωc εἰλ]ηφότα· ἐφ' ᾧ κατεψήφ[ιcα]ν̣

10 *ἦνιc* || 28 *ειλιθ-* || 31 *ωδει-* | *απετεικ-* || 33 *κοτ* | *πειcηc* || 35 *-νεικην* || 38 *cυκο—* || 40 *-φοτα εφ*

Col. II (Pf. p. 91-92, 95, 97, 98)
αἰκίcαcθαι [τ]ούτου τὸν ἀνδριάντα. ἐπεὶ δὲ
λοιμ[ὸ]c ἐπικ̣α̣τ̣[έ]π̣[εc]εν, ἔγνωcαν οἱ πολῖ-
ται αὐ[το]ῦ παρὰ τοῦ [᾽Α]πόλλωνοc ὡc διὰ τὴν
ἀ̣τ̣ι̣μ̣ί̣α̣ν̣ α̣ὐτο̣[ῦ π]ρ̣ο̣cβέβλητ[αι α]ὐτοῖc.
τὸ μὲν ἄγαλμα τ̣[οῦ Εὐ]θυκλ[έο]υc κ̣ατ' ἴcον
τῷ̣ τοῦ Διὸc ἐτ̣[ίμη]cαν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ βω-
μὸν ποιήcαντε[c . .] . τ̣[.] . . [. .]υ̣ . [. ἱ]c̣ταμέ-
νου μηνόc.

δ̄ [Αἰτίων]

Μοῦ]cαί μοι βαcιλη[14 *ἀεί]δειν*
Α]ὕτη *πρώτη ἐλ[ε]γ[εία*]τ̣ρ̣ου̣[
]ν̣ *ἱcτορία[*]*απερ*[
]*cαι* . [ ] . *ει*[
7 lines lost
]*ε*
]ο̣π̣*ε*[
. .]*ι* . . [ ]ω̣[9 ᾽Απ]*όλ-*
λων γὰρ παῖc ὢ̣ν κ̣[ρατήcαc τοῦ] Πυ-
θοῖ̣ δράκοντο[c] *ἀ[πενίψα]το* [*τὰc*] *χεῖ-*
ραc ἐν τῶι Πη[*ν*]*ει*[*ῷ̣* . .]ν̣δ̣[.] π̣α̣[*ρα*]*κειμέ-*
νην δάφνην ειδ̣[. .] . *ει*[. .] . *ἐκτεμὼν*
περιβάλλει τῶι̣ [. . . .] *ειω̣* . *ι*.

῎Ενθ', ῎Αβδηρ', οὗ νῦν . [. .]λ̣εω φαρμακὸν
ἀγινεῖ ᾽Αβδήροιc *ὠνητὸc ἄνθρω-*
ποc καθάρcιον τῆc πόλεωc, ἐπὶ πλίν-
θου ἑcτὼc φαιᾶc, θοίνηc ἀπολαύων
δαψιλοῦc, ἐπειδὰν διάπλεωc γένηται,
προάγεται ἐπὶ τὰc Προυρίδαc *καλου-*
μέναc πύλαc· εἶτ' ἔξω τοῦ τείχουc

περίειϲι κύκλωι περικαθαίρων (?)
αὐτῶι τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τότε ὑπὸ
τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων λι-
θοβολεῖται, ἕωϲ ἐξελαϲθῇ τῶν
ὁρίων.

Α[. . .]Μελικέρτα, μῆϲ ἐπὶ πότνια Βύνη

42 πολει- || 44 ατει- || 46 ετει- || 58 δράκοντο[ϲ, ι seems to have been written above a deleted c || 63 αγει- || 64 ποϲ written again below first ποϲ || 65 θ in θου corr. from δ | εϲτοϲ, first c seems deleted with ν added above | -ων is corr. || 66 δαψιλαϲ επι- || 67 -αγονται || 69 -αιρειων

Col. III (Pf. p. 98, 99, 101, 102)

'Εξῆϲ' *ἐπεὶ ϲὺν* Μελικέρτηι *τῶι παιδὶ ἑαυ-*
τὴν κατεπόντιϲεν 'Ινώ, *ἐξέπε-*
ϲεν εἰϲ αἰγιαλὸν τῆϲ Τενέδου *τὸ ϲῶ-*
μ[α] τοῦ Μελικέρτου· *τοὺϲ δὲ ἐκεῖ πο-*
τε κατοικοῦνταϲ Λέλεγαϲ *ποιῆϲαι*
αὐτῷ βωμόν, ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλιϲ ποιεῖ
θυϲίαν, ὅταν π̣ε̣ρὶ μεγάλων φο-
βῆται, τ̣ο̣ι̣[ά]νδ[ε]· γυνὴ τὸ ἑαυτῆϲ βρέ-
φοϲ κα[ταθῦϲα]ϲ̣α̣ π̣α̣ραχρῆμα τυφλοῦ-
ται. τοῦ[το δ' ὕϲ]τ̣ερον κατελύθη, ὅτε
οἱ ἀπὸ 'Ο̣[ρέϲτου] Λέ[ϲβ]ον̣ *ᾤκηϲαν.*

Νέκταροϲ . [. . . . .]ν . υ̣θιον γένοϲ η-
ραπεδο[ ]Λιπαραιο̣[. . . . . .]ο
Τυρϲην̣[9]ι̣αϲ[
. . .]ετηϲ̣[9]δο[
]. . [
7 lines lost
]. τε[

Τὸν νεκρ[ὸ]ν . [. . . . .]. τ[. . .]υβατονιϲ
τιναενω [. . . . .]μ̣[.]ν̣η . *ενουϲ πωϲ*
αὐτοῦ πα[ῖ]δ[α Λειμ]ώνην̣ *φθαρεῖϲαν λά-*
θρα εἰϲ τὸν θ[άλα]μ̣ο̣ν [ϲ]υγκατακλείϲαϲ
ἵππῳ διὰ το[ύτ]ο̣[υ] διέφθειρεν· ὅθεν 'Αθήνη-
ϲιν τόπο[ϲ] 'Ἵππου *καὶ* Κόρηϲ· *τὸν δὲ*
ϲυγγενόμενον αὐτῆι δόρατι παίϲαϲ

νεκρὸν ἐξέδηcεν ἵππου, ὥcτε κα-
τὰ τοῦ ἄcτεοc cύρεcθαι.

Θεοὶ πάντεc κομποῖc νεμεcήμονεc, ἐκ δέ τε
πάντων Κυνηγὸc †αλωιοc† *ἑλὼν*
κάπρον ἐπεῖπεν οὐ δέον Ἀρτέμιδι *ἀνα-*
τιθέναι τοὺc ἡγουμένουc ἐκείνηc
καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἀνήρτηcε τὴν κεφαλὴν
τοῦ ὑὸc ἐξ αἰγείρου,
ὑφ' ἧ καθυπνώcαc ἐπιπεcούcηc αὐ-
τῷ τῆc κεφαλῆc ἀπέθανεν.

75 *cὺν* add. Castiglioni || 76 *ειναι* || 79 λελεξαc, ξ corr. to γ || 81 *θυcιαc*, second c corr. to *ν* || 95 *ιc* | *cυνκα-* || 96 *διεφθι-* || 98 *cυν-* || 100 *-θαι*⟦c⟧ || 103 *ωδεον* || 104 *τιθο-* || 106 *-ρου*⟦*καθυπνουc*⟧

Col. IV (Pf. p. 103-106)
Τυρcηνῶν τείχιcμα Πελαcγικὸν εἶχέ
με γαῖα· Ἱcτορεῖ *περὶ τῶν* Ἀθήνη-
cιν Πελαcγικῶν *ὅρων* (?) *καὶ τοῦ ποιηθέν-*
τοc ὑπ' αὐτῶν τείχουc.

Εὐθύμου τὰ μὲν ὅccα παραὶ Διὶ Πῖcαν ἔχοντι
Ὅ[τ]ι *ἐν* Τεμέcῃ *ἥρωc περίλοιποc τῆc* Ὀ->
δ̣υ̣ccέωc νεὼc ἐδαcμοφόρει ἐπιχω-
ρ[ίου]c̣ τε καὶ ὁμόρουc, οὓc κομίζονταc
αὐτῷ κ̣λίνην καὶ κόρην ἐπίγαμον
ἐ̣άcανταc ἀπέρχεcθαι ἀμεταcτρε-
πτεί, ἔωθε̣[ν] δὲ τοὺc γονεῖc ἀντὶ παρ-
θέ̣[ν]ου γυ̣[ναῖ]κα κομίζεcθαι. τὸν δὲ
δ[αc]μ̣ὸν [τοῦ]τον ἀπέλυcεν Εὔθυμοc
πύ̣κ̣τηc [. .]. *λ̣έξαc τὰc̣ [τῷ ἥρ]ωϊ κυ-*
ν . . ζ[. . . . . . .]φηα̣φηc[. . . . .]. . .
πρ[*]το . [*
cυ[ ] . . [
4 lines lost
]γι̣ . α̣φ[
τὸ ξόα]νον τῆc Ἥραc [*ἀνδρι-*
αντοειδὲ]c̣ *ἐ[γέ]νετο ἐπὶ β̣αc̣ι̣λέωc*
Προκ[λέουc· *τὸ*] *δὲ ξύ̣[λο]ν, ἐξ οὗ εἰργάcθη*
ε . . η[. . . .]. αμ[.]c . . ν, ἐξ Ἄργουc *δέ φα-*

cι [. . . . . .]ọτạc ἔτι πάλαι cανιδῶ-
δεc [κομι]cθῆναι κάταργον ἅτε μηδέ-
πω π[ροκ]ẹκοφυίαc τῆc ἀγαλματομικῆc.

Ἥρῃ τῇ Cαμίῃ περὶ μὲν τρίχαc ἄμπελοc ἕρπει
Λέγεται ὡc τῇ Cαμίαι Ἥρᾳ περιέρπει
τὰc τρίχαc ἄμπελοc, πρὸc δ' ἐδά-
φει λεοντῆ βέβληται, ὡc λάφυρα
τῶν Διὸc νόθων παίδων, Ἡρακλέ-
ουc καὶ Διονύcου.

Ἡcύμναc Ἐφέcου, Παcίκλεεc, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ δαίτηc
Φηcὶν ὅτ[ι] Παcικλῆc Ἐφεcίων ἄρχων
ἐξ εὐωχίαc ἀνέλυεν· ἐπιτιθέμε-
νοι δέ τινεc αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ cκότουc
ἐδυcθετοῦν, ὅτε δὲ προῆλθον πρὸc
τὸ Ἥραιον, ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Παcικλέουc
ἱέρεια οὖcα διὰ τὸν ψόφον τοῦ
διωγμοῦ λύχνον ἐκέλευcεν προ-

109 τυρcι- || 110 γαια· || 111 on ὅρων cf. crit. app. Pf. 103 || 113 ευδημου | εχοιτι corr. to εχοντο || 118 αμεταccτρε- || 120 κομιειζ- || 122]ωϊ || 133 -τομκηc corr. to -τομικηc || 134 ηρητα || 135 \τη/ cαιμ- | περιερπειν ε-λεγε || 137 λεοντηνβεβληcθαι, cθ corr. to τ || 140 ηcυμ- || 144 -ηλθον corr. from -ηλθεν | πρὸc add. Stroux ap. Pf. || 145 μητερ

Col. V (Pf. p. 106-111, 123)
ενεγκεῖν ⟨οἱ⟩· οἱ δẹ̀ τυχόντεc φωτọ̀c ἀνεῖ-
λον αὐτῆc τọ̀ṇ παῖδα.

Ἥρωc ὦ κατὰ πρύμναν, ἐπεὶ τόδε κύρβιc
ἀείδει Φηcὶν ὅτι ὁ καλούμενοc "κα-
τὰ πρύμναν ἥρωc" Ἀνδρόγεώc ἐcτιν·
πάλαι γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸν Φαληρικὸν
ὅρμον εἶναι, οὗ τὰc ναῦc ὁρμίζεcθαι
πρὶν γενέcθαι τὸν Πειραιᾶ.

Οἰcύδρεω Θρῄϊκοc ἐφ' αἵματι πολλὰ Θάcοιο
Φηcὶν Παρίουc Οἰcύδρην τὸν Θρᾷκα
φονε[ύ]cαντας διαπολιορκηθῆναι Θα-
cι[. . .]ωc τὸ ἀρέcκον Βιcάλταιc [ἐ]πιτί-
μιο[ν τ]ίνειν ἔχρηcεν ὁ θεόc· οἱ δετει-

χο. [. .]. αυνοθ. . [. . . .] Θαϲίοιϲ ἐρ[ω]τῶ-
ϲι[. . .]ειν. η. [. . . . . . .]πέμπειν πα[
. [. . . . . .]. [.]. α. [. . . . .]. . πλη. κο
. [

]δε [. . . . . . .]. υ[. . . . .]ιδετωνδ. . [
Φ[. . . . . . .]πιϲο[. . . . .]νο. [
. . . . . .]ταιομ[. . . . .]καγ[
. . . . . .]ϲχι[. .]. [. . . . .]εναγι[
. . . . .]. . φοραν α. [. . . . . .]ϲημαιν. [
. . . . . ϲδεον. ε φι[λάδελ]φον ἀπολελ[
. . . τ]ὴν Ἀν[τ]ιγόνην ὡϲ οὐδὲ ἐκειν[

Ὧδε [. . .]γείνεϲθε Πανελλάδοϲ, ὧδε τελέ[ϲ]ϲαι
Φ[η]ϲὶ Πευκετίων προϲκαθημένων [τ]οῖϲ
τείχεϲι τῆϲ Ῥώμηϲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων Γά-
ϊον ἐναλλόμενον καταβαλεῖν τὸν
ἐ]κείνων ἡγούμενον, τρωθῆναι δὲ εἰϲ
τὸν μηρόν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῷ ϲκάζειν
δυϲφορήϲαντα παύϲαϲθαι τῆϲ ἀθυμίαϲ
ὑπὸ τῆϲ μητρὸϲ ἐπιπληχθέντα.

Ἀργὼ καὶ ϲέ, Πάνορμε, κατέδραμε, καὶ τεὸν ὕδωρ
Φηϲὶ τοὺϲ Ἀργοναύταϲ, ὑδρεύϲαϲθαι ἀ-
ποβάνταϲ εἰϲ Κύζικον ἀπολιπεῖν τὸν
λίθον ἐνθάδε ᾧ ἐχρῶντο ἀγκύραι, ἅτε
ἐλαφρότερον ὄντα—τοῦτον δ' ὕϲτερον
καθιερωθῆναι Ἀθηνᾷ—, ἕτερόν γε μὴν
βαρύτερον ἀναλαβε[ῖ]ν.

Πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖϲιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ᾗ τε φέρονται
Φηϲὶν ὅτι Κόνων κατηϲτέριϲε τὸν Βερενί-
κηϲ βόϲτρυχον, ὃν θεο[ῖϲ] ἀναθήϲειν ὑπέϲχε-
το κείνη, ἐπειδὰν ἐπανήκῃ ἀπὸ τῆϲ κατὰ Ϲυ-
ρίαν μάχηϲ.

148 οἱ corr. Maas || 153 -ληρεικον || 154 οιμον || 156 θρηϊκοϲ || 158 -ϲαντεϲ || 159 βει- || 160]εινειν || 161 ερωτωι || 172 πανν or παλιν || 175 ϊον | κατακα- || 176 ⟦ε⟧τρω || 180 παροϲμε | χαιτεον || 183 λινον | αγκυραια || 185 καταιερ- || 188 βερνι- || 189 βοϲϲτρυ- | -θηϲιν

Col. VI (Pf. p. 123, 163, 172, 174)

Τῶν δ Αἰτίων Καλλιμάχου διηγήςειc (in the margin above col. VI)

Ἀκούcαθ' Ἱππώνακτοc· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω

Ὑποτίθεται φθιτὸν Ἱππώνακτα cυγκαλοῦντα τοὺc φιλολόγουc εἰc τὸ Παρμενίωνοc καλούμενον Cαραπίδειον· ἥκουcι δ' αὐτοῖc κατ' εἴλαc ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν ἀλλήλοιc, λέγων ὡc Βαθυκλῆc Ἀρκὰc τελευτῶν τήν τε ἄλλην οὐcίαν διέθετο καὶ δὴ χρυcοῦν ἔκπωμα τῶι μέcῳ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμφάλκῃ ἐνεχείριcεν, ὅπωc δῷ τῶι ἀρίcτωι τῶν ἑπτὰ cοφῶν. ὁ δὲ ἐλθὼν εἰc Μίλητον ἐδίδου τοῦτο Θάλητι ὡc διαφέρ[ο]ντι τῶν ἄλλων, ὁ δὲ ἀπέπεμψε πρὸc Βίαντα τὸν Πριηνέα, ὁ δὲ πρὸc Περίανδρον τὸν Κορίνθιον, ὁ δὲ ὡc Cόλωνα τὸν Ἀθηναῖον, ὁ [δ]ὲ πρὸ[c] Χίλωνα τὸν Λ[α]κεδαι[μό]νιον, ὁ δὲ πρὸc Π[ιτ]τακὸν τὸν Μιτυλη[ναῖον], ὁ δ]ὲ πρὸc [Κ]λεύ[βο]υ̣λ̣[ο]ν τὸν Λί[νδι̣[ο]ν. [τὸ δὲ ἔκπωμα] ὑπὸ τούτου [π]ε̣μφθὲν [ἦλθε πάλιν εἰc Θάλητα· ὁ] δὲ ἀνατίθη̣[cι] τ̣ῶι [Δ]ιδυ[μεῖ Ἀπ]ό[λλωνι δὶc λαβὼ]ν ἀριcτε[ῖο]ν. τοιγαρ[οῦν ἔφη . [. . . . .]αιο . [. . . . . . .] ἀλλήλων̣ κρ . τ[. . . . .]ι̣ο̣ι̣cτ̣[. . . . ἐ]ρ̣ίζεcθε.

Ἦν κε⌊ῖν⌋οc ο⌊ὐ⌋νιαυτόc, ᾧ τό τε ⌊πτ⌋ηνόν Τάλλ̣[α] ζῶια ὡμοφώνει ἀν̣[θ]ρώποιc, μέχρι κ̣ατὰ λύcιν γήρωc ἐπ[ρέ]c̣βευcεν ὁ κύκνοc πρὸc τοὺc θεοὺc καὶ ἀλώπηξ τὸν Δία ἐτόλμηcεν μὴ δικαίωc ἄρχειν φάναι. ἔκτοτε δὲ εἰc ἀνθρώπουc μετήνεγκεν αὐτῶν τὴν φωνήν, καὶ λάλοι ἐγένοντο· Εὔδημοc δέ, φηcίν, τὴν κυνὸc ἔcχε, Φίλτων δὲ ὄνου, παρεπικόπτων τούτουc, ἴcωc δὲ καὶ Cαρδιανὸν εἶπε τὸν Αἴcωπον.

Εἴθ' ἦν, ἄναξ ὤπολλον, ἡνίκ' οὐκ ἦα

Καταμέμφεται τὸν καιρὸν ὡc πλούτου μᾶλλον ἢ ἀρετῆc ὄντα, τὸν δὲ

πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἀποδέχεται ὃς τῆς ἐναντίας ἣν τούτων γνώμης· παρεπικόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν *τινα, ὡς κεχρημένον τῇ ὥρᾳ πορισμῷ, ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς πλουσίῳ συσταθέντα.*

192 *ηκωι* || 193 *συν-* || 194 *τασυνκαλοντα* | *φιλοσοφους* corr. to *φιλολογους* | *ιστο* || 195 *σαραπει-* || 200 *ενεχι-* || 203 *οσδεαπ-* || 205 *-ναιων* | *χειλ-* || 213 *η\ν/κε-* || 214 *ομο-* || 221 *εκχε* | *παρεκοπ-* || 224 *ειειθην* | *ουκεα* || 226 *τονδετονδε* || 229 *ευδημον* || 230 *πορισμον* || 231 *της* corr. from *τες* | *πλουσιω* corr. from *πλουσιας* | *συνστα-*

Col. VII (Pf. p. 177, 185, 189, 193)

Εἷς—οὐ γάρ;—ἡμέων παῖ Χαριτάδεω καὶ σύ

Διεφέρετο ὁ ποιητὴς πρός τινα τῶν ἐφαμίλλων· Σῖμος *δέ τις παρατυχὼν παρυπέκρουεν ἄμφω παρενδεικνύμενος ἴσος εἶναι.* Θρᾶικα *δέ φησιν αὐτὸν καθεστάναι παιδοκλέπτης ἐστί. καὶ γὰρ τὸν αἶνον παρατίθεται ἀκόλουθον, ὡς ἐν* Τμώλῳ *δάφνη καὶ ἐλαία διεφέροντο ὑπὲρ πρωτείων (παρεπεφύκεσαν δ' ἀλλήλαις), διεξῄεσαν δὲ τὰ προσόντα ἑαυταῖς χρήσιμα. ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ διαφερομένων ὑποτυχοῦσα βάτος παλαιά· "πέπαυθε πρὶν εἰ μὴ ἐ[π]ίχαρτοι τοῖς δυσ[μ]ενέσι γενώμεθα" (π[αρ]επεφύκ[ει δ' αὐ]ταῖς). πρ]ὸς ἣν ἀποβλέψασα [. . . . .] ἡ δάφν]η "ὦ κακὴ λώβη", φη[σίν], "⌊ὡς δὴ μ⌋ί' ἡμέ⌋ων καὶ σ⌊ύ; . . .]σεικο[. . . . .]ςυε . .]ινητ[. . .]ατωδρα[. . . . . .]εισεις*

Ὦ ξεῖνε—συμβουλὴ γ[ὰ]ρ ἕν τι τῶν ἱρῶν—

Γραμματο[δ]ιδάσκαλ[ο]ν, *ὄνομα* Ἀπολλώνιον, *οἱ δὲ* Κλέωνά *τινα, ἰαμβίζει ὡς τοὺς ἰδίους μαθητὰς καταισχύνοντα, ἐν ἤθει εὐνοίας ἀπαγ[ο]ρεύων τούτωι δρᾶν, μὴ ἀλῷ.*

Ἀλεῖος ὁ Ζεύς, ἁ τέχνα δὲ Φειδία Γνωρίμῳ *αὐτοῦ ἀποπλέοντι κατὰ θέαν τοῦ* Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς *εἰς* Ἦλιν *διηγεῖται*

μῆκοϲ ὕψοϲ πλάτοϲ βάϲεωϲ θρόνου ὑποποδίου αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὅϲη ἡ δαπάνη, δημιουργὸν δὲ Φειδίαν Χαρμίδου Ἀθηναῖον.

Ἑρμᾶϲ ὁ Περφεραῖοϲ Αἰνίων θεόϲ *Περφεραῖοϲ Ἑρμῆϲ ἐν Αἴνωι τῆι πόλει τῆϲ Θρᾴκηϲ τιμᾶται ἐντεῦ-*

232 *ἴϲου* || 235 *παρενδικ-* | *ιϲοϊ* || 238 *ωμον* | *κελευθον* || 239 *δάφνη καὶ* ins. N.-V. and Vo. | *ὕπερ* || 243 *πεπανθαι* || 244 *χαρτοιϲ* : corr. N.-V. || 251 *-δαϲκαλ[.]υ* || 254 *ηθειϲ* || 255 *αλλω* || 256 *φιδια* || *ριϲμω* | *δεαν* || 261 *-ουργου* | *φιδιαν* || 263 *αινειων* || 264 *αιγεινωι* || 265 *τειμ-*

Col. VIII (Pf. p. 193, 195, 196, 198)

θεν· Ἐπειὸϲ πρὸ τοῦ δουρείου ἵππου ἐδημιούργηϲεν Ἑρμᾶν, ὃν ὁ Cκάμανδροϲ πολὺϲ ἐνεχθεὶϲ κατέϲυρεν· ὁ δ' ἐντεῦθεν προϲηνέχθη εἰϲ τὴν πρὸϲ Αἴνῳ θάλαϲϲαν, ἀφ' ἧϲ ἁλιευόμενοί τινεϲ ἀνείλκυϲαν αὐτὸν τῆι ϲαγήνηι. ὅτε ἐθεάϲαντο αὐτόν, καταμεμψάμενοι τὸν βόλον, πρὸϲ ἀλέαν ϲχίζειν τε αὐτὸν καὶ παρακάιειν αὐτοῖϲ ἐπεχείρουν, οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον (?) ἔφθαϲαν ἢ τὸν ὦμον παίϲαντεϲ τραύματοϲ τύπον ἐργάϲαϲθαι, διαμπερὲϲ δὲ ἠϲθένηϲαν· καὶ ὅλον αὐτὸν καίειν ἐπεχείρουν, τὸ δὲ πῦρ αὐτῶι περιέρρει. ἀπειπόντεϲ κατέρριψαν αὐτὸν εἰϲ τὴν θάλαϲϲαν. ἐπεὶ δ' αὖτιϲ ἐδικτυούλκηϲαν, θεὸν νομίϲαντεϲ εἶναι ἢ θεῶι προϲήκοντα καθιδρύϲαντο ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ ἱερὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀπήρξαντό τε τῆϲ ἄγραϲ ἄλλοϲ παρ' ἄλλου αὐτὸ̣ν̣ πε̣[ριφέρω]ν. τοῦ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ χρήϲαντοϲ εἰ[ϲεδέξαν]το τῇ πόλει καὶ παραπ]ληϲίωϲ τ[οῖϲ θεοῖϲ] ἐτίμων.

Ἀ]ργώ κοτ' ἐμ[π]ν[έ]οντοϲ ἤκαλον ν̣ότου *Ἐπίνικοϲ Πολυκλεῖ Αἰγινήτηι νικήϲαντι διαύλωι Ἀμφορίτηι ἐν τῆι πατρίδι. τὸ δ̣' ἀγώνιϲμ̣α τοῦτο· πρὸϲ τῶι τέρματι τοῦ ϲταδίου κεῖται ἀμφορεὺϲ πλήρηϲ ὕδατοϲ, ἐφ' ὃν δραμὼν κενὸϲ ὁ ἀ*

*νος ἀναλαβὼν τὸν ἀμφορέα ἀνακάμ-
πτει, προφθάcαc δὲ νικᾳ̃. κατήχθηcαν
δὲ ἐντεῦθεν οἱ 'Αργοναῦται ἐπιβάντεc
τῆc Αἰγίνηc, ἡμιλλήcαν δὲ ἀλλήλοιc ὑ-
δρευόμενοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ θᾶττον· ὁ δ' ἀγὼν
'Υδροφόρια καλεῖται.*

'Ερμᾶ τί τοι τὸ νεῦρον ὦ Γενειόλα Φιλη-
*τάδου παιδὸc εὐπρεποῦc ἐραcτὴc ἰδὼν
'Ερμοῦ ἄγαλμα ἐν παλαιcτριδίωι ἐντε-
ταμένον, πυνθάνεται μὴ διὰ τὸν Φιλη-
τάδαν. ὁ δέ φηcιν ἄνωθεν εἶναι Τυρcη-
νὸc καὶ κατὰ μυcτικὸν λόγον ἐντε-
τάcθαι, ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ αὐτὸν φιλεῖν τὸν
Φιλητάδαν.*

Τὰc **'Αφροδίταc—ἡ θεὸc γὰρ οὐ μία—** 'Εν 'Α-

272 *βολον* corr. from *πολον* | *προcνεαν* | *cχιζιν* || 277 *ρει απει* || 278 -*ερ-
ρειψαν* || 279 *δ'* : not *δὲ* Pf. || 281 *ϊερον* || 284 *παρα* : not [*π*]*αρα*- Pf. ||
285 *π*]*λη*- : not *πλη*- Pf. | *ετει*- || 286 *εν*[]*ν*[]*οντοc* | *επει* || 287 *αιγει*- ||
288 *αμφοτερητηι* || 289 *γωνιμα* || 290 *αμφορευc* corr. from *αμφοτερουc* ||
292 *καμ*— || 295 *αιγει*- | *ϋ*- || 297 -*φορεια* || 298 *ερμα* corr. from *αρμα*
| *φιλι*- || 300 -*cτριδειωι* || 304 *ταcθαι επι* || 306 *αφροδειταc* | *εναc*

Col. IX (Pf. p. 198-200, 205)

cπένδῳ τῆc Παμφυλίαc *τῆι* Καcτνίῃ 'Α-
φροδίτηι ὗc ἱερουργεῖται ἐντεῦθεν·
Μόψοc *ἀρχηγὸc τῶν* Παμφυλίων *ἐπὶ θήραν
ἐξιὼν εὔξατο αὐτῆι εὐβολήcαc ὃ ἂν λά-
βοι πρῶτον καλλιερήcειν. καὶ δὴ θηράcαc
κάπρον ἐτέλεcε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. ἀφ' οὗ
καὶ* Παμφύλιοι *μέχρι νῦν τοῦτο ποιοῦ-
cιν· εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἥδετο ἡ θεόc, οὐκ ἂν ὁ* Μό-
*ψοc ἐκυνήγηcεν τοῦτο. ἐπαινεῖ δὲ καὶ
τὴν 'Ερετριέων* Ἄρτεμιν, *ὅτι πᾶν τὸ
θυόμενον οὐκ ἀποcείεται.*

'Αλλ' οὐ τὸν 'Υψᾶν, ὃc τὸ cᾶμά μεν Διημαρ-
*τημένωc λέγεται παροιμία "ἁρπα-
γὰ τὰ* Κοννάρου"· "Κοννίδα" *γὰρ χρὴ λέγειν.
ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ παρῆλθεν·* Κοννίδαc

μέτοικος ἐν Σελινοῦντι *πλουτήσας ἐκ πορνοβοσκίας παρὰ μὲν τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον . εν ἐφήμιζεν, ὡς τὴν οὐσίαν τῆι τε* Ἀφροδίτηι *καὶ τοῖς φίλοις διανεμεῖν. τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡ διαθήκη εὑρέθη περιέχουσα "ἁρπαγὰ τὰ* Κοννίδα*"· ὅθεν ὁ δῆμος ἐξελθὼν τοῦ θεάτρου ἥρπασεν τὰ* Κοννίδα. Σελινοῦς *δὲ πόλις* Σικελίας.

Ἄρτεμι Κρηταῖον Ἀμνίσου πέδον Τοῦ*το γέγραπται εἰς ἕβδομα θυγατρίου γεννηθέντος* Λέοντι *γνωρίμωι τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ἐν ᾧ φησιν διενεγκεῖν τῶν †δεμνηθεντων τῆι* Ἥβῃ *ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τὸν αἰσθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ* Ἀπόλλωνος *ὕμνον.*

<u>Μοῦ</u>**σαι καλαὶ κἄπολλον, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω·** Ἐν *τούτωι πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομένους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆι πολυειδείᾳ ὧν γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι* Ἴωνα *μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεύη τεκταινόμενον.*

308 -*φροδει*- | *ϊερ*- | space before *εντευθεν* || 309 *αρχηχος* | Pf. adds *τῶν* before *παμφ*- || 310 -*cαcονειλα* || 315 *εκενηγη*- || 319 -*οιμια αρπα* || 320 -*ρου κον*- || 322 *εμcειουντι* || 324 *αιcιαν* || 325 *αφροδει*- || 326 *νεμειν τε*- || 330 *cελει*- || 332 -*πται ειc* || 335 *ηιβη ϋπο* || 336 *ϋπο* || 337 -*ον*⟦*μουcαι*⟧ || 338 *cπενδω*· || 342 *ϊωνα μειμειται* || 343 -*ειδηc* || 344 ⟦c⟧*cκεύη*⟦\c/⟧

Col. X (Pf. p. 216-218, 223, 227)

Ἡ Λῆμνος τὸ παλαιόν, εἴ τις ἄλλη Πρὸς *τοὺς ὡραίους φησίν· ἡ* Λῆμνος *πάλαι ποτὲ εὐδαίμων γενομένη ἐκακοδαιμόνησε, ἐπιθεμένων τῶν θηλειῶν τοῖς ἄρρεσιν· διόπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀποβλέπετε.*

Ἔνεστ' Ἀπόλλων τῶι χορῶι Παροίνιον *εἰς τοὺς* Διοσκούρους· *καὶ* Ἑλένην *ὑμνεῖ, καὶ παρακαλεῖ τὴν θυσίαν δέξασθαι· καὶ προτροπὴ*

τοῖc cυμπόταιc εἰc τὸ ἀγρυπνεῖν.

'Αγέτω θεόc· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ δίχα τῶνδ' ἀείδειν 'Ἐκ-
θέωcιc 'Αρcινόηc' *φηcὶν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀνηρπάc-*
θαι ὑπὸ τῶν Διοcκούρων *καὶ βωμὸν καὶ τέ-*
μενοc αὐτῆc καθιδρῦcθαι πρὸc τῶι 'Εμπορίωι.

Δαίμονεc εὐυμνότατοι, Φοῖβέ τε καὶ Ζεῦ, Διδύ-
μω[ν] γενάρχα 'Απ[ό]λλων *ἐκ* Δήλου *ἀφικνεῖ-*
ται εἰc τὸ τῆc Μιλήτου *χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται*
νῦν ἱερὰ ὕλη, ἵνα Βράγχοc.

'Εκάληc

'Ακταίη τιc ἔναιεν 'Ερεχθέοc ἔν ποτε γουνῶι
Θηcεὺc *φυγὼν τὴν ἐκ* Μηδείηc *ἐπιβου-*
λὴν διὰ πάcηc ἦν φυλακῆc τῶι πατρὶ Αἰγεῖ,
ἅτ' αἰφνίδιον ἀνακομιcθὲν ἐκ Τροιζῆνοc
μειράκιον αὐτῶι οὐ προcδοκήcαντι. βουλό-
μενοc δ' ἐπὶ τὸν λυμαινόμενον τὰ πε-
ρὶ Μαραθῶνα *ταῦρον ἐξελθεῖν ὅπωc*
χειρώcαιτο, καὶ εἰργόμενοc, κρύφα
τῆc οἰκίαc ἐξελθὼν περὶ ἑcπέραν ἀ-
πῆρεν. αἰφνίδιον δὲ ὑετοῦ ῥαγέντοc
κατ' ἐcχατιὰν οἰκίδιον θεαcάμενοc
'Εκάληc *τινὸc πρεcβύτιδοc ἐνταῦθα*
ἐξενοδοκήθη. πρὸc δὲ τὴν ἕω ἀναc-
τὰc ἐξῄει ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, χειρωcάμε-
νοc δὲ τὸν ταῦρον ἐπανῄει ὡc τὴν 'Εκά-

345 *ητιc* || 346 *φηcιν η* | *ευδαι—* || 347 *-θεμενη* || 348 *ημειc* || 350 *παρ-οιμιον* || 354 *αϊδειν* || 355 *αυτην* corr. from *αυτηc* || 357 *-ιδρυcαι* || 359 *αφικνι-* || 360 *μιλητου* corr. from *μιλεπτου* || 361 *νῦν* om. Pf. | *υληι* | *βρα\γ/χοc* || 364 *μηδειαc* || 367 *μιρα-* || 370 *κρυφα—* || 371 *εccπεραν* || 372 *πηρετ* || 373 *καθ* || 375 *την εω αναc* : Hollis (1990: 65) prints *ανα-* | *cταc* || 376 *εξηcι*

Col. XI (Pf. p. 227, II p. 41, 46)
λην· αἰφνίδιον δὲ ταύτην εὑρὼν τεθνηκυῖ-
αν ἐπιcτε[νάξ]αc ὡc ἐψευcμένοc τῆc προcδο-
κίαc, ὃ ἐφ[. . .]εν μετὰ θάνατον εἰc ἀμοιβὴν
τῆc ξενίαc ταύτηι παραcχέcθαι, τοῦτο ἐπε-

τέλεϲεν, δ[ῆ]μον ϲυνϲτηϲάμενοϲ ὃν ἀπ' αὐτῆϲ ὠνόμα[ϲ]εν, καὶ τέμενοϲ ἱδρύϲατο Ἑκαλείου Δι[ό]ϲ.

Ζηνὸϲ ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ ϲπονδῆϲιν ἀείδειν

Ἐνταῦθα Ἀρκάδεϲ καὶ Κρῆτεϲ ἀντιποιοῦνται τῆϲ Διὸϲ γενέϲεωϲ ἑκάτεροι λέγοντεϲ παρ' αὐτοῖϲ γεγεννῆϲθαι τὸν θεόν (Κρῆτεϲ δὲ καὶ τάφον αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεικνύντεϲ, το[ῦ]τό γε ψευδόμενοι), ἀφορμὴν τοιαύτην εἰληφότεϲ· τῆϲ γὰρ Παρραϲίαϲ μοίραϲ ἔν τινι ὄρει θαμνώδει ἀποτεκοῦϲα Ῥέα τὸν Δία Νέδῃ μιᾷ τῶν Ὠκεανίδων εἴϲω τῆϲ Κρήτηϲ φέρειν ἐνεχείριϲεν, ὅπωϲ κρύφα τρέφοιτο ἐκεῖϲε.

Οἷον ὁ τὠπόλλωνοϲ ἐϲείϲατο δάφνινοϲ ὅρπηξ

Προτερατευϲάμενοϲ ὡϲ ἐντεθεαϲμένων καὶ τῶν ἀψύχων ἐπὶ παρουϲίᾳ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ δαφνίνων τε κλάδων ϲειομένων καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τεμένουϲ, ἐπιλέγει δεῖν χορεύειν τοὺϲ παῖδαϲ καὶ κιθαρίζειν, γεγαληνῶϲθαι δὲ καὶ τὸ πέλαγοϲ ἐφ' ὕμνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺϲ περιπαθεῖϲ ἀνέχειν τοῦ θρηνεῖν. προϲιϲτορεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ πολύτεχνον τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι καὶ τοξότηϲ ἀγαθόϲ ἐϲτι καὶ ἰατρὸϲ καὶ μάντιϲ καὶ ἐπόπτηϲ τῆϲ τροφῆϲ τῶν θρεμμάτων, καὶ ὡϲ χαίρει πόλεων κτίϲεϲιν οὐδ' ἀρχιτεκτονίαϲ ἀπολείπεται· ἔτι δὲ τετραέτηϲ ὢν ἐν τῆι Δήλωι βωμὸν ἐκ κεράτων κατεϲκευάϲατο. καὶ εἰδὼϲ† ὅτι Κυρήνηϲ τὴν κτίϲιν Βάττῳ τῶι Θηραίωι διεϲήμηνε, κόρακα παραϲχόμενοϲ ἡγεμόνα· ὡϲ πρῶτον μὲν ἐν Σπάρτηι ἐτετίμητο, δεύτερον δὲ ἐν Θήραι, τρί-

381 παραϲϲχ || 383 ειδρυ- || 385 παραϲϲπον- || 388 διοϲενεϲεωϲ || 391

τοcαυ- || 392 *ρηcιαc* | *-ωδι* || 393 *διαενενδη* || 397 *δαφνικοc* || 398 *-θεαμε* || 400 *α⟦πο⟧πολ-* || 402 *-λεγειν* || 403 *γεγαλη—* || 408 *ϊατροc* || 417 *ετελειμητο* || 418 *δευτερονδευτερον* | *θηραιc*

Col. XII (Pf. II p. 46)

τον δὲ ἐν Κυρήν̣ηι *μ̣ε̣τὰ τὰc ἀποικία*[c ̣] ̣
τὸν λέοντα ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ Βάττωι ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣
μενον (hereafter column is left empty)

44 *PSI* 11, 1219 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. M. Norsa-G. Vitelli, *Bulletin de la Société Royale d'Archéologie d'Alexandrie* 28, 1933, 123-132 + pl.
re-ed. by G. Vitelli, *Papiri Greci e Latini* 11, Firenze 1935, 139-149; and R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus. Fragmenta* I, Oxford 1949, 3ff.
cf. Pack 196
* text adopted from re-ed. Pfeiffer

Contents: *diegeses* of *Aetia* book 1

Fr. 1 (Pf. p. 3, 11, 13, 17)

̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]ι **μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύ]ζουσιν ἀοιδῇ**
]τει ̣ δ[̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣
] ̣ Διονυcίοιc δυ[c]ί, τῷ ελ
]νι κ(αὶ) τῷ ἰλειονι κ(αὶ) ᾿Αcκλη-
πιάδῃ τῷ Cικε]λίδῃ κ(αὶ) Ποcειδίππῳ τῷ ονο-
] ̣ υρίππῳ τῷ ῥήτορι κ(αὶ) Α̣ν̣α̣-
]βῳ κ(αὶ) Πραξιφάνει τῷ Μιτυ-
ληναίῳ καταμε]μφομ(έν)ο[ι]c αὐτοῦ τὸ κάτιc̣-
χνον τῶν ποιη]μάτ(ων) κ(αὶ) ὅτι οὐχὶ μῆκοc η̣ρ̣α̣
̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣ [̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]ουμ(εν)ο ̣ [̣]οι ̣ [̣ ̣] ̣
̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ων λο̣υ̣ ̣ [̣]ο̣ ̣ [̣] ̣ πα ̣ ̣ [̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]
παρα]τίθεταί τε ἐν c(υγ)κρίcει τὰ ὀλίγων cτί-
χ(ων) ὄν]τ̣(α) ποιήματα Μιμνέρμου τοῦ Κο-
λοφω]νίου καὶ Φιλίτα τοῦ Κῴου βελτίονα
τ(ῶν) πολ]υcτίχων αὐτ(ῶν) φάcκων εἶναι[
ὡc κ]ατ' ὄναρ c(υμ)μείξαc ταῖc Μούc[αιc ἐν ᾿Ε-
λι]κ̣ῶνι εἰλήφοι π(αρ') α)ὐτ(ῶν) τ(ὴν) τ(ῶν) αἰτίων [ἐξήγη-
cιν ἀ]ρ̣τιγένειο̣c̣ ὤ̣ν, ωνκ΄ὑ̣ε̣μνηcε̣[
ἀ]π̣' αὐτ(ῶν) ἀ̣ρχ̣ὴν λ̣αβὼ̣ν̣ ε΄οc΄α[
] ̣ λόγου>

. . .] . ταϲ[. . . . .] . . κῶϲ ἄν̣[ιϲ αὐλῶν
ζητ]εῖ δ(ιὰ) τίνα̣ [αἰτίαν ἐν Πάρ]ῳ χωρὶϲ αὐ[λοῦ κ(αὶ) ϲτε-
φάνου ταῖϲ Χ[ά]ριϲι θ[ύου]ϲι. Μίνῳ [τ]ῷ Δ[ιὸϲ κ(αὶ) Εὐρώ-
πηϲ θαλαϲϲοκρατο(ῦν)τι κ(αὶ) ταῖϲ Χάρ[ι]ϲιν ἐν Π[άρῳ θύ-
οντι Ἀ[ν]δρόγεω τοῦ παιδὸϲ θάνατοϲ ἀπηγγ[έλλε-
το. ὁ δ(ὲ) οὔτε τ(ῶν) Χαρίτ(ων) τ(ῆϲ) θυϲίαϲ ἠμέληϲεν, ἀλ[λ' ἔ-
θυϲεν, οὔτε τοῦ παιδὸϲ τὸν θάνατον παρενό̣[μη-
ϲεν, τὸν δ' αὐλητ(ὴν) ἐπέϲχε κ(αὶ) τὸν ϲτέφανον ἀ[πέ-
θετο· κ(αὶ) οὕτωϲ π(αρὰ) τοῖϲ Παρ[ίο]ιϲ τὸ ἔθοϲ ἔμεινε· τ̣[αῦ-
τά τε ο(ὖν) π(αρὰ) Κλειοῦϲ φηϲιν ἀκη[κο]ένα[ι] καὶ περὶ τ̣ῆϲ [τ(ῶν)
Χαρίτ(ων) γενέϲεωϲ ὡϲ Διονύ̣[ϲου ε]ἰ̣ϲὶ κ(αὶ) Κορων[ίδοϲ
νύμφηϲ Ναξίαϲ, αὐτὸϲ προειπὼν ὡϲ παρ' [οἷϲ
μ(ὲν) ἱϲτορο(ῦν)ται Ἥραϲ κ(αὶ) Διὸϲ [εἶν]αι, παρ' ο[ἷ]ϲ δ(ὲ) Ε[ὐρυ-
ν]όμηϲ τ(ῆϲ) Ὠκεανοῦ κ(αὶ) Διόϲ, παρ' οἷϲ δ(ὲ) Ε[ὐάν-
θηϲ τῆϲ Οὐρανοῦ κ(αὶ) Διόϲ. τ(ὴν) δ'ἱϲτορίαν ἔλαβεν π̣[αρὰ Ἁγίου
κ(αὶ) Δερκύλου. (ἐϲτὶ) κ(αὶ) π(αρὰ) Ἀριϲτοτέλει ἐ[ν] τῇ Παρίω[ν
πολειτεί[α].
κῶϲ ⌊δέ, θ⌋εαί, . . [. . .] μὲν ἀν⌊ὴρ Ἀνα⌋φαῖοϲ ἐπ' ⌊αἰϲ[χροῖϲ
ζητεῖ δ(ιὰ) τίνα̣ αἰ[τίαν ἐν Ἀνάφῃ μ(ετὰ) αἰϲχρ(ῶν) εἰϲ ἀλλήλουϲ
λόγων Ἀπόλλω[νι, ἐν δὲ Λίνδῳ Ἡρακλεῖ
μ(ετὰ) κ(ατα)ρῶν θύουϲι. [πρῶτον οὖν Καλλιόπη ἱϲτορεῖ ὡϲ ὅ-
τε Ἰάϲων ἐ[κ Κόλχων
]ϲ̣[

. . . .

4 ἴλ- or ἴδ- || 7 -φάνῃ || 8 καταμε[in crit. app. Pf., who prints , τοῖϲ με[in the text || 14 βελτειονα || 23 μεινω || 26 δ'⟦ε⟧ουτε || 30 κ(αὶ) π(ερὶ) τ(ῆϲ) || 33 ἵϲτο- || 34 τ̓δωκεανου (δ perhaps deleted) || 35 τ(ῆϲ) || 42 ἴαϲων

Fr. 2 (Pf. p. 31)

. . . .
] . . . [.]ειϲτι[.]ιη[
]των θύουϲι τω . [
]ϲαντο τοῦ ἔθουϲ[
ν]ομιζόμ(εν)α τὰ ἱερὰ π̣[
] . πάντ(ων) πέτρων κ(αὶ)[
] . μετεδιδάχθηϲαν[
]αϲθαι Λίνδιοι κ(αὶ) τοῦτο̣[
α]ὐτοῖϲ. π(αρα)τίθεται δ(ὲ) κ(αὶ) αλλ̣[
ὅ]μοιον, ἡνίκα απαι[
]π(ερι)έτυχεν Θειοδά[μαντι
]ν κ(αὶ) τω̣[
. . . .

47 ἵερα

45 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2263 Oxyrhynchus, II/III

ed. pr. E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20, London 1952, 125-129 + pl. XII
re-ed. by R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus. Hymni et Epigrammata* II, Oxford 1953, 107-112 (ad fr. 26-31f)
cf. Pack 205
* inspexi

Contents: *diegeses* of *Aetia* book 1

Col. I

]̣.
]ερι[.]ων
]̣ ων
]̣ την
]νδ[.]ας
]
]̣ ικεν
]̣ ειδι
]ατην
]ρτ̣
]̣ υ
]ολ
]̣ ρα
]υςε
]

Col. II

κ]ατῴκηcαν πόλιν ὀνο-
μαζομένην] Τριποδίcκον. ὅθε[ν
Ἀργεῖοι κ]ατὰ [τ]ὸν καλούμε-
νον Ἀρν]εῖον [μ]ῆνα τοὺc πα-
ρατ]υ[χόν]ταc κ[ύ]ναc ἀναιροῦ-
cιν. ἔ]λαβ[ε] δὲ τὴ[ν] ἱcτορίαν ὁ Κα[λ-
λί]μαχ[ο]c παρὰ Ἀγία καὶ Δερ-
κ]ύλ[ο]υ.
τῶ]c μὲν ἔφη· τὰc δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸc πά-
λιν εἴρετο θυμόc τῆc ἐν Λευ-
καδίᾳ Ἀρτέμιδοc τὸ ξόανον
ἐ]πὶ τῆc κεφαλῆc θυείαν ἔ-
χει δι' αἰτίαν ταύτην· Ἠπει-
ρῶται τ[.]ν . [.] . η . [.] . . η[.] . . .
καταρτέχ[ο]ντεc τὴν Λευκά-
δα ἐcύλων. ἐλθόντεc δὲ καὶ
εἰc τὸ τῆc Ἀρτέμιδοc ἱερὸν εὗ-
ρον τὴν θεὸν ἐcτεμμένην
χρυcῷ cτεφάνωι· τοῦτον ἐπι-
χλευάcαντεc ἀφεῖλον καὶ>
τὴν θυείαν, ἐν ᾗ cκόρδα τρί-
ψαντεc ἔφαγον, τῆι θεῶι ἐπέ-
θηκαν. ἐπι . ν . [.] . . . δ' οἱ Λευ-
κάδι[οι] . . θ' ἡμ[έ]ρα[ν ἑ]τερον
κατεcκεύαcαν cτέφανον καὶ
ἀντὶ τῆc θυεία[c] ἔθηκαν, ἀπο-
πεcόντα δ' αὐτὸν προcήλω-
cαν τῷ ξοάνωι. πάλιν δὲ με-

Col. III

ρηcαια[
λωcηε . [
γν[.]υcα[θυ-
γατροc[
.]ον κα . [
. .]εμων[
. [.]ο[.]δαυ[
χα[.]πυ . [
δι . νου . [
τοcτομι . [
εφη μη . [
πειcαcπ . [
νηcενε . [
θυcια . [
γε[
ουλ . [
θ . [.]κα[
θω[.]υτ[
ρουcιφ . [
αc περι . [
τυραννι[
επεμψ[
αναδ . α . [
.]ημα . [
παντο . [
παραν[
νιδα . [
ειν τοιc . [

] θ' ἡμέ[ρας] τρεῖς ἐπιτιθεμέ- οι θεοι[
] νου κα[ὶ] . . με[ί]να[ν]το[ς .] . ης των θα . [
. . . .] . [
. . .

col. i 15]ω̄ || 16] . ων, vertical before ων :]ων ed. pr. || 17] . , vertical :]την ed. pr. || 21-22 ζη]τεῖ δι- | [ὰ τίνα αἰτίαν] suppl. Pf. || 23]ρτ . Lobel :]ρτο(ν) Pf.
col. ii 12 θυïαν || 17 ïερον || 21 θυïαν | τρει- || 26 θυïα[

Fr. 2 (Pf. p. 112)

. . . .
] . . . [
] . ε ἐπιφω . [
]ο παρη . . [
4]ερι τὴν τα[
. . . .

The following signs are added to the original text; they are made with a thicker point and in a lighter ink (see ed. pr. for a precise description of all the traces): 2] . εεπ`ίφω . [ || 3 πάρη . . [ || 4 above ι is a small ο | τ`τα[

46 *P.Oxy.* 20, 2258 fr. 9 Oxyrhynchus, V-VII?

ed. pr. E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20, London 1952, 69-103, esp. 81 (cf. preliminary ed. in R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus. Fragmenta* I, Oxford 1949, 226)
cf. Pack 186; text reprinted in Hollis (1990: 66)
* inspexi

Contents: summary of *Hecale*

Fr. 9 back

. . . .
]ην χωρ[ ]να
]ενοσηνυ[
] . πεφευ[
] . . ντ . . λ |] . . [ ] . [
5]ν ἐκπέμπε[ ]ουκ[
]νης κρύβδ . [ ] . ηεπ[
ὑε]τοῦ κα[τ]αρραγέντος[
νυκτὸς ἐ]πιλαμβανούσης[

ο]ἰ̣κον ʽΕκάληϲ̣· τ̣[
] . [ ] . [
. . . .

9 -ληϲ·

47 *P.Mich.* inv. 6235 ?, II-III

ed. pr. L. Koenen-W. Luppe-V. Pagán, Explanations of Callimachean αἴτια, *ZPE* 88, 1991, 157-164 + pl. IV
cf. A.S. Hollis, *ZPE* 92, 1992, 115-117

Contents: *diegeses* to *Aetia* book 1? (cf. comm.)

fr. 1

. . . . . .
]θεν
]κα̣ὶ αλ
τ]ὸ̣ν̣ ʼΑπόλ-
λωνα]μ̣ε[. . . .] . ανα
]μενο[. .] . ο̣λ̣λω—
] . παρε̣ι̣[.]ι δ' ἀϲφα-
]τιο̣ϲ ἐγένετο·
]
]ν ʼΑθήνηϲ ἔχον
] . ατοϲ ἀπὸ αἰτ̣ί̣—
αϲ]νεϲ ἐπορεύοντο
]ερ τῆϲ ʽΕλένηϲ
τὸ]ν̣ ʼΑγαμέ̣μνονα
]ρουϲ τῆϲ ʼΑρκαδ̣ί̣-
αϲ]ϲ̣ηϲ οὐκ ὀλίγηϲ·
]ν ϲτρατεύειν α .
]ηνα δεκηλ . ϲε
]νθη φίλῳ αυ[
]καὶ μὴ ἕωϲ α . [
]α̣κτων [.]π̣ι̣τ̣[
]αϲειναa[
]ον μη[
]ν ʼΑρκα[
]ωτου ξ[

For extensive supplements, cf. ed. pr. || 4] ̣ , vertical stroke || 5 prob. 'Α-]π̣ό̣λλω- ed. pr. || 7 εγενετο followed by small ink mark or high stop || 10] ̣ , λ or μ, cf. θεή]λατος ed. pr. : τραύ]μ̣ατος Hollis 116 : or ἀγάλ]μ̣ατος? || 15 -γηϲ˙ || 16 ̣ , prob. ν || 17 ἡ 'Αθ]ηνᾶ δ' ἐκή̣λ̣η̣ϲε suppl. ed. pr. || 19 "above the ε appears what, if it is ink, is of slightly different color than the original scribe's ink and could be interpreted as an accute accent." ed. pr. || 21 prob.]αϲ εἶνα[ι ed. pr.

Fr. 2

. . . .
]α̣νηα
] ̣ ιου—
]εκει
] ̣ ̣ ̣ ()
. . . .

This fr. may provide the line ends for 21-24 (cf. ed. pr. 158) || 26] ̣ , α or λ

48 *P.Hamb.* 3, 199 ?,II

ed. pr. B. Kramer, *Griechische Papyri der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg*, 3, Bonn 1984, 25-34 + pl. III
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 56, 1984, 31-32; Montanari (1995: n. 24)

Contents: MH *Il.* 1, 38 Cilla (ll. 1-18); -, 38 Tenedos (ll. 19-26); -, 39 Smintheus (ll. 27-30)

Col. I

Κ̣ί̣λλαν τε ζαθέην˙ Πέλοψ ὁ̣ Ταν[τά-
λου μ̣ι̣ϲθὸ̣ν̣ π̣α̣ιδικῆϲ ὥρα̣ϲ̣ λαβὼν
παρ̣ὰ̣ [Ποϲειδ]ῶ̣νοϲ ἵππουϲ ϲὺ̣ν ὀ-
χή̣μ̣α̣τ̣[ι ἐπ]ὶ̣ τ̣ὸ̣ν̣ τῆϲ 'Ιππο-
δαμεία[ϲ γ]ά̣μο̣ν̣ ἔϲπευϲεν εἰϲ
Πῖϲαν τ̣ὸ̣[ν] μνηϲτ̣[η]ρ̣ο̣κτόνον
Οἰνόμαον ἐπιθυμῶ̣ν̣ κ̣[α]τ̣α̣[γω]ν̣ί̣-
ϲαϲθαι. γενομέν̣ῳ δ' αὐτῷ κα-
τὰ Λέϲβον Κίλλ̣[οϲ ὁ] ἡ̣ν̣ίοχοϲ τὸν
βίον προλ̣[εί]πει˙ π̣ρ̣[ὸϲ] δ̣ὲ̣ ἀπώλειαν
̣ ̣ [̣ τ]ὴ̣ν χώραν ἔχοντ̣ο̣ϲ̣ α̣ὐ̣-
τ]ο̣ῦ̣ [ϲφ]οδρὰν ὀδυν̣η[̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣
δ̣ε̣η[̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ [̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]ν̣ο̣ι

κο̣ . [. . .] . [. . . . .]η
. ε̣[. . .] . . . [. . . . .] . ο̣
] . ροc γε[
]ν̣ ἀ̣π̣ο̣[
] Κ[ί]λ[λ]α̣ν̣
. . . .

7 *οινομαν* || 9 *ην̣`ι´οχοc* || 10 *προλ̣[ι]πει* | *απωλιαν* || 12 *cφ]οδ̣`ρ´αν*

Col. II

τῇ ἀδελφῇ ε̣[ἰc τὴν κάταν-
τα θάλατταν [ἔρριψεν. ἡ δὲ
λάρ̣ναξ κατάγ̣[εται θείᾳ
γ̣ν̣ώμῃ τῇ τό̣[τε μὲν ἐπικα-
λουμένῃ νήc̣[ῳ Λευκόφρυι,
Τενέδῳ δ' ὕcτ[ερον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
προcαγορευθε̣[ίcῃ. οὕτωc
Μ̣υ̣ρτίλοc καὶ Ἑ[λλάνικοc
Cμινθεῦ, εἴ π[οτέ τοι χαρί-
εντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν [ἔρεψα.
ἐν Χρύcηc πόλιν τ̣[ῆc Μυcίαc
Κ̣ρ̣ῖ̣ν̣[ι]c̣ ἦν ἱε̣[ρεύc
. . . .

19 *ε̣[ἰc τὴν κάταν-* Luppe 31 : *Λ̣ε̣[υκοθέᾳ καὶ κα-* ed. pr. || 25 *οὕτωc* suppl. Luppe 32 : *ἱcτοροῦcιν* ed. pr. || 26 *Μυρτίλοc καὶ Ἑ[λλάνικοc* Montanari (1995: n. 24) and suggested to me by D. Holwerda : *Μύρτιλοc καὶ Ε̣[ὐριπίδηc* ed. pr. || 27 *ζμιν-* || 28 *εντ'* || 30 *ϊε̣[*

49 *P.Oxy.* 3, 418 Oxyrhynchus, I-II or IV?

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, London 1903, 63-65
cf. Pack 1164; A. Ludwich, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 24, 1904, 317-320; Montanari (1995: n. 36)
* there is a slide of this pap. in the Ashmolean Museum, which I examined

Contents: MH *Il.* 1, 263 Pirithous (ll. 1-8); -, 264 Caeneus (ll. 9-22); -, 399 conspiracy of the gods against Zeus (ll. 23-32)

γυ]ναῖκαc· ὅθεν αὐτοὺc [οἱ
Λαπίθαι καταcτά]ντεc εἰc πόλεμον ἐκ τοῦ[

Πηλίου ὄρους διώ]κ̣ουςι εἰς Μαλέαν ὄρος τῆς
Πελοποννήςο]υ̣ ὅπου Ἡρακλῆς αὐτοὺς διέ-
φθειρεν· ἦν δ]ὲ Πειρίθους π̣α̣ῖ̣ς̣ Διός· Δία
] διατρίβουςα Διῒ μεταβαλόν[-
τι τὴν φύςιν εἰ]ς ἵππον ἐμίγη καὶ Πειρίθου[ν
ἐγέννηςεν.]
Καινέα τ' Ἐξάδιό]ν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον
ὁ Καινεὺς Ἐλάτου] μὲν παῖς, Λαπιθῶν δὲ βαςιλε[ύς,
πρότερον παρθέ]νος εὐπρεπὴς ἐγένετο· δ[
. . . . μιγέν]τος αὐτῇ Ποςειδῶνος αἰτηςα[μέ-
νη μεταβαλεῖν νε]ανίας ἄτρωτος γίνεται· γ[εν-
ναιότατος δὲ τ]ῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρξας τὸν [
ὄγκον τῆς εὐδαι]μ̣ονίας οὐκ ἐβάςταςεν· ἐξευ[τε-
λίςας δὲ καὶ το]ὺς θεοὺς παρ' οὐ[δὲν ἐποιή-
ςατο καί ποτε πή]ξας ἀκόντιον ἐν[
13] ἀγορα τοῦτο θεὸν π̣[ροςέτα-
ξεν ἀριθμεῖν· Ζεὺ]ς δὲ ἀγανακτήςα[ς Κενταύ-
ροις πολεμοῦν]τα καίπερ ἄτρωτο[ν ὄντα ὑπο-
χείριον ἐποίηςε]ν· ἐλάταις γὰρ κα[ὶ δρυςίν
οἱ Κένταυροι] αὐτὸν ἤρειςαν εἰς [γῆν.
ὀ̲π̲π̲[ότε μιν] ξ[υν]δῆςαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤ[θε]λ[ον ἄλλοι
γράφ[ου]ςί τινες καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· φ[αςὶ γὰρ
ὅτι Διὸς ἐπικρατέςτερον χρωμένου [τῇ τῶν
θεῶν βαςιλείᾳ Ποςειδῶν τε καὶ Ἥρα κα[ὶ Ἀπόλ-
λων ἐπεβούλευςαν αὐτῶι· Θέτις δὲ γνοῦςα [παρὰ
Νηρέως τοῦ πατρός, ὃς μάντις ἦν, δηλοῖ τῶ[ι Διῒ
τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν καὶ ςύμμαχον παραδίδωςι τ̣[ὸν
Αἰγαίωνα ἑκατόγχειρον Ποςειδῶνος παῖδα[·
Ζεὺς δὲ Ἥραν μὲν ἔδηςεν, Ποςειδῶνι δὲ κ[αὶ
Ἀπόλλω]ν̣ι προςτάςςει θητεῦςαι Λαομέδον[τι

1-2]ναικας· | [οἱ Λα- | πίθαι κτλ. ed. pr. ‖ 2-3 τοῦ [Πη- | λίου ed. pr. ‖ 3 μαλαι- ‖ 6 διατρει- | Διϊ μεταβα⟦λ⟧λον[‖ 11 εγενετο· ‖ 12 ποςι- ‖ 13 νε]αν⟦ε̣ι̣⟧\ι/ας | γεινεται· ‖ 15 ὄγκον τῆς εὐδαι] suggested to me by D. Holwerda : . . . . τῆς ἡγε] ed. pr. ‖ 17-18 [μεςη τη 13]αγορα ed. pr. : [μεςαιτά | τη τῆς Γυρτῶνος] ἀγορᾷ Ludwich : ἐν [τῷ με | ςαιτάτῳ τῆς ἀγο-ρᾶ<ς>? Montanari ‖ 19 ἀριθμεῖν suppl. cf. Σ *Il.* 1, 264 : νομιζειν ed. pr. ‖ 20 ατρ⟦ο⟧\ω/το[ν ‖ 21]ν· ‖ 22 ηριςαν ‖ 24 απολλων· ‖ 26 βα⟦λ⟧ς | ποςι- ‖ 27 αυτωι· ‖ 28 πατρος ⟦μ⟧ος ‖ 30 αιγε- | εκατονχειρονποςι- ‖ 31 ποςι- ‖ 32 θητευς⟦ι⟧αι

50 *P.Oxy.* 56, 3830 + *P.Lond.Lit.* 142★ Oxyrhynchus, II

★ *ed. pr.* H.J.M. Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, London 1927, 121; identified as MH by R. Pfeiffer, *Philologus* 92, 1937, 16ff.; cf. Pack 1188
ed. pr. M.A. Harder, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 56, London 1989, 37-44 (incl. the London fragment) + pl. II
cf. M. Haslam, *BASP* 27, 1990, 31-36; —, *Glotta* 70, 1992, 35-36; W. Luppe, *Gnomon* 64, 1992, 291-293 (supplements on l. 39ff.); —, *APF*, 39, 1993, 9-11
* inspexi

Contents: MH *Il.* 7, 8 Arithous (l. 1); -, 44 Helenus and Cassandra (ll. 2-13); -, 86 Hellespont (ll. 14-21); ? (ll. 22-26); 8, 479 gigantomachy (ll. 27-37); 9, 447 Phoenix (ll. 38-48)

Fr. 1 + fr. 2 col. I

πα]ν̣τευχίαν ἡ δ' . [
τῶν δ' Ἕλενος Πριάμοιο φίλος π]α̣ῖς ϲύνθετο θυμ̣[ῷ μυ-
θεύεται τῶν ἐξ Ἑκάβηϲ γενο]μ̣ένων Πριάμω̣[ι παίδων
τὸν Ἕλενον καὶ τὴν Καϲϲάνδρ]α̣ν διδύμουϲ γ̣[εγενῆ-
ϲθαι· τῶν δὲ γενεθλίων ὑπὲρ] αὐτῶ̣ν̣ ϲυντε[λουμέ-
νων ἐν τῷ τοῦ Θυμβραίου Ἀπό]λλωνοϲ ἱερῶ[ι
τὸν Ἕλενον καὶ τὴν Κ]αϲϲάνδραν ε[
τῇ δὲ ὑϲ]τεραίαι ἐλθόνταϲ . [
] . . . αι ταῖϲ γ[λώϲ-
ϲαιϲ] . περικαθαίροντα̣[ϲ
]δὲ ὄφειϲ εὐθέω[ϲ
] . ηϲαν ὅθεν ϲυ̣[νέβη
τοὺϲ παῖδαϲ τῆϲ μαντικῆϲ] μεταϲχεῖν [. . .]‾ Ἀντικλείδ(ηϲ)
ϲῆμά τε οἱ χεύωϲιν ἐπὶ πλατ]εῖ Ἑλληϲπ[όντ]ω̣ι̣ Ἀθά-
μαϲ ὁ Αἰόλου μὲν παῖϲ βαϲιλεύ]ων δὲ τῶν Θηβῶν γή-
μαϲ Ἰνὼ τὴν Κάδμου θυγατέρ]α ἔϲχε παῖδαϲ δύο Λέ-
αρχον καὶ Μελικέρτην· κατὰ δ]ὲ Ἥραϲ προϲτάγματα
ἀποπεμψάμενοϲ] ἐπέγημε Νεφέλην
ἐξ ἧϲ ἔϲχε δύο παῖδαϲ Ἕλλην τ]ε̣ καὶ Φρίξον· μιγνύμε-
νον δὲ αὐτὸν λάθρα τῇ Ἰνοῖ κατ]οπτεύϲαϲα ἡ Νεφέ-
λη ᾤχετο, πάλιν δὲ τῆϲ οἰκίαϲ ἐπικ]ρατήϲαϲα ἡ Ἰν̣ὼ̣ ἐπε-
. . . .

1 δ' || 13 αντικλει\δ/ || 15 παιϲ]ων ed. pr. || 18 νεφελην· || 19 φριξον· || 21 ϊν̣ω̣

Fr. 2 col. II + fr. 3 col. I (lines are not counted separately) and II (ll. 28ff.)

. [
. θ . [
τα̣ . [
. . . [
τ̣ . . [
γαίης [καὶ πόντοιο, ἵν' Ἰάπετός τε Κρόνος τε
lines lost

fr. 3 . . . . . Οὐ-
ρ]ανοῦ καὶ Γῆς πα[ιδ-
.]ηι ὅτι τε νέος ὢ[ν (?)
. .]ν· ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς μ[
. .] . βαλὼν α . [
col. I κερ]αυνοῖς γὰρ καὶ ἀ̣[στραπαῖς
]ς ἐνεῖρξεν τε̣ε̣[
. . .]ἀρχὴν Κρόνωι . [
] . . [τ . . δ̣ιαφέρειν οφει[
] . ς την ἀ[π'] αὐτοῦ προσῃ[γορευ ἡ (δ') ἱ-
] . την στορία παρ' Εὐ̣φ̣ο̣ρ̣ί̣ω̣νι̣[
] . υ̣ν̣ οἷον ὅτε [πρ]ῶτον λίπον [Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα Φοῖνιξ
ὁ̣ Ἀμύ̣ντορος καὶ Ἱππο̣[δαμείας
πεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς μ[ητρὸς
ὅ]πως μισῇ τοῦτον ε̣[ἐπαρᾶ-
τα̣[ι] κατὰ τοῦ Φο̣ίνικ[ος μή ποτε παῖ-
δα̣ς γεννῆσασθαι· . [
ἄχθος παραγίνετα̣[ι ὁ δὲ αὐ-
τὸν ἀσμένως ἐδέχ[ετο
]τι ανκα̣τιθεται τοῦ πα[
κ . αν[. . . . . . .] . τοσε . [
παρε . [. . . . . .] . ει[

28-34 lineation different from ed. pr., cf. Haslam (1990: 33-34) || 30]ν· || 37-46 the letters which are underlined are provided by *P.Lit.Lond.* 142. I underline several letters differently from the ed. pr. (not further indicated) || 38 *οιον οτε πρ-* ed. pr. || 43 -*σθαι*· || 44 ἄλθος coni. Haslam (1990: 35 and 1992) | *παραγει-* || 46 *κα[ὶ] τίθεται* Haslam (1990: 35) || 48 *παρ' Ἐρ̣[α-τοσθέ]ν̣ει* (suggested in comm. ed. pr.) is very likely

51 *PSI* 8, 1000 (ostr.) ?, I-II?

ed. pr. P. Viereck, *Papiri greci e latini* 8, Firenze 1927, 209
re-ed. by L. Salvadori Baldascino, *CCC* 9, 1988, 259-262
cf. Pack 2463; Cribiore (1996: no. 183 and pl. XIX)
* text printed according to re-ed.

Contents: MH *Il.* 13, 217 Pleuron and Calydon (ll. 1-3)

] . . . τῆc N
ὃc πάcῃ]Π̣λευρῶνι καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι
Αἰτωλὸc ὁ ᾿Ε]ν̣δυμίωνοc παῖc κατήντηc-

2 επεινη || 3]νδυμει-

52 *P.Oxy.* 42, 3003 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. P.J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 42, London 1974, 15-19
* inspexi

Contents: MH *Il.* 13, 301 Thessalians (ll. 1-2); -, 302 Phlegyae (ll. 3-11); -, 459 founding of Aenea (ll. 12-21); ? (ll. 22-23); 14, 319 Danae and Perseus (ll. 23 end-35); 15, 229 aegis and Amalthea (ll. 36-42)

Col. I

. . . .
] . [ ] . [
13 Θεcc]αλο[ὶ] καλοῦντα[ι ἡ] ἱ̣cτορία πα-
. . . .] ἡ[ὲ με]τὰ Φλεγύαc μεγ[αλήτο]ραc· Φλε-
γύαι . . .]ο̣ῦντεc . φερ̣θ . νιαν ἐλῄ[ζον]το τοὺc πε-
ριοίκουc]· Θηβαίων δὲ εὐλαβουμέ̣[νω]ν̣ αὐτοὺc
οἱ περὶ Ζῆθ]ον καὶ ᾿Αμφίονα τειχίζουcι τὴν πόλιν· εἶ-
χε γὰρ ᾿Αμ]φίων ἀπὸ τῶν Μουcῶν λύραν χρυcῆν
δι᾿ ἧc τοὺc] λίθουc ἔπειθεν· ὃ οὐκέτι ἦλθον οἱ Φλεγύ-
αι . . . .]ε̣c ἕωc ἀποθανόντων τῶν περὶ Ζ̣ῆ[θο]ν
cὺν Εὐρυ]μάχῳ τῷ βαcιλεῖ ἐπήρχοντο κα . ετο̣ . [. . .]
. . . .] αὐτοὺc ᾿Απόλλων κατεταρτ̣[ά]ρωcεν.
βῆναι ἐπ᾿] Αἰνείαν. τὸν δ᾿ ὕcτατον ε[ὗρ]εν ὁμ̣ίλου
Τροίαc ἁλ]ούcηc Αἰνείαc ἀποπλέων μετὰ τοῦ πα-
τρὸc τὴ]ν θρέψαcαν γῆν ἐναυάγηcεν π̣[ε]ρ̣ὶ ῎Αθω̣[]

. . . . . .]θεντων δ' αὐτῶν cυμβα[ί]νει τὸν 'Αγχί-
cην διὰ τ]ε τὸ γῆρας καὶ τὸν κόπον τελευτῆcαι
. . . .]η δε ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ Αἰνείου ὅπου καὶ τὰ
νῦν τάφοc] 'Αγχίcου καλούμενοc˙ γενομένου δὲ
. . . .]υ κατὰ πρύμναν φηcι τῷ cυακι τῆc
] . ου περι . [.] . ρ . ν ἐπιcτῆν[αι ἔ]νθα κατὰ
τὴν 'Αφρο]δίτηc τῆc μητρὸc ἐντολ[ὴν κ]τίζει πό-

3 -το]ροc· || 4 ελη̈[|| 5]˙ || 6 τειχι\ζ/ουcι | πολιν˙ || 7 χρυcην˙ || 8 -θεν ο || 11 -cεν″ || 12 αινειαν | υc- | ε[| -λου′ || 17 υπο του υϊου αινειου˙ || 18 αγχει- | -μενοc˙

Col. II

. . . .
] . ορειαπ[
]ουκατεc . [. .] . . [] . [Δανά-
ηc, καλλιcφύρου . [
"Α]ργουc βαcιλέωc[
νομένῳ τῷ πα[
κρίνατο˙ ὁ δὲ ὀργ . [
κα αὐτὴν βάλλει . [
θάλαccαν˙ π . [] . . . [
νηcω ανα . [] . β[
τῆc βαcιλείαc φ[
γὰρ εκαλ . . . οοπα[
. κτελε . . . cυντ[
φευγοντο . . [. .] . [
. . . χ . . . υτου . [
ἀλλὰ cύ γ' ἐν χείρεccι [λάβ' αἰγίδα θυccανόεccαν 'Ρέα τε-
κοῦcα Δία . . [] . [
. αθέμενη τὸν π[
και Θέμιδι ἡ δε[
τὴν 'Αμαλθείαν [
γαντοcε . ρ . . . . [
κεναι ταύτην λ[

27 κρεινατο˙ || 28 κα⟦θ⟧αυτην || 29 -cαν˙ || 36 χερ\ει/ρεc\c/ι || 39 θέμιδι ῆ || 40 αμαλθιαν [|| 42 space before λ[

53 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4096 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. P. Schubert, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 61, London 1995, 15-46 + pl. V-VII
cf. M. Haslam, *ZPE* 110, 1996, 115-117; W. Luppe, *Anal. Pap.* 7, 1995, 15-18 (on fr. 5 and 6 col. I); —, *Eikasmos* 7, 1996, 207-210 (on fr. 3); —, *Hyperboreus* 2.2, 1996, 189-193 (on fr. 11); —, *Prometheus* 22.2, 1996, 97-100 (on fr. 8); —, *ZPE* 112, 1996, 25-28 (on fr. 10) and 29-33 (on fr. 5, 7, 52); M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *ZPE* 113, 1996, 24-26 (= corrected reprint of *ZPE* 112, 1996, 34-36; the abbreviation 'Rossum' is used to refer to this article in the critical notes)
* inspexi

Contents: MH *Il.* 18, 319 epithet ἐλαφηβόλος (fr. 2); 18, 432 Phocus (fr. 1); 18, 486 Pleiades (fr. 1 + 2); 20, 53 Callicolone (fr. 16); 20, 403-404 epithet Ἑλικώνιος (fr. 3); 21, 194 horn of Amalthea (fr. 4); 21, 448 epithet νόμιος (fr. 5 + 6); 22, 29 Icarius, Erigone (fr. 5 + 7 + 52); 22, 126 (fr. 24); 23, 92 Achilles' golden vase (fr. 8 + 9?); 23, 141-142 sacrifice of Achilles' hair (fr. 10); 23, 346-347 Arion (fr. 10); 23, 683 origin of running naked (fr. 11); 24, 24 Hermes (fr. 11); 24, 602 Niobe (fr. 12)

Fr. 1 (18, 432; 486)

. . . .
]ποιϲ[
] . δεανειϲ[
]αι αὐτὸϲ ε[
] . [.] . ν ϲτρατηγ̣[
]ενφυϲειχ̣ετοτη[
]δὲ φώκῃ γενομέν̣[ῃ
]εν. ἡ δ' ἔγ̣κυοϲ γενο̣[μένη ἔτεκε
]π̣αῖδα ὃν̣ καὶ διὰ τ̣ὴν [μεταμόρ-
φωϲιν Φῶκον πρ̣οϲ[ηγόρευϲε.
ἡ δ' ἱϲτορία παρὰ Θε̣οπ̣[όμπῳ.

]**Πληϊάδαϲ.** [] Ἄτ̣λαϲ [ε]ἷϲ τῶ̣[ν Γιγάν- 18, 486
των μιχθ̣εὶϲ Π̣λ̣ηϊ̣όν[ῃ τῇ Ὠκε-
]α̣ν̣ο̣ῦ̣ ἔϲχε̣ν ἑπτὰ̣ [θυγατέρας
]νην Μερόπη[ν Ἠ-
λέ]κ̣τ̣ρ̣α̣ν π̣[. .] . . [
] . θ̣αναε . . [
τῆ]ϲ μητρ̣[οϲ

]λογου̣[
] . αο[

. . . .

3 α\ι/⟦ρ⟧ || 7 ε⟦ν̣⟧\γ̣/κυος || 12 πλει̣- || 15 Ηλε]κ̣τρ̣αν Haslam :] . ττα̣ν ed. pr. || 16] . θ\α/να-, instead of θ, perhaps ο with a stroke through it || 17 suppl. Haslam || 18 υ̣[: . [ed. pr.

Fr. 2 (18, 319; 486)

. . . .

]	. [. .] . κα̣[
]	. [.] . νε[
]δ̣ε . ε̣λ̣[. . . . .]	δ̣[.]ε̣ταγ̣[
] . σανεπ . . . .]	προσαγ̣ . [
]α̣ντε̣ . [. .]σπλ[. . .] .	νοσειδ[
] . ητουν̣των̣[. .] .	αὐτῷ ε̣[
] . [. .] . βολειων ≻	εἶδον α[
]τ̣ατο̣ν ≻	νας ὑπο̣[
Ἀρτέ]μ̣ιδι τα[ῦ]τα	τῷ Διι̂ . [
] . ν θεὸν καὶ	Ζεὺς κατ̣[ελεή]σας αὐτὰς πε-
] . ἐ̣ν̣[τε]ῦθεν εν	λειάδα̣[ς ἐποίησε
]λ̣αιαν καὶ ἀχμαι	διὰ τὴν α̣[
ἐλαφη]βόλον κληθῆν[α]ι̣	γων κατ̣[
]ἐλάφων ἀ̣ναιρ[ ]	μίαν τ . [
ἡ δ' ἱστορία] παρὰ [Σω]κράτει̣[ ]	νομακ . [
[	]α̣ιουπρο[

3]δ ed. pr., but α also possible || 6 first] . , perhaps β̣ which would allow the suppl. ἀμφισ]βητούντων
col. ii 3 γ̣[ed. pr., but perhaps π || 4 π̣ροσαγ̣[ορευ ed. pr., but there is another vertical trace at the end: instead of γ̣ . [, perhaps π̣[|| 11 above ε is a dot || 14 τῷ̣[ν ed. pr., but το̣[more likely

Fr. 3 (20, 403-404)

. . . .

ρὰ Ἀκ]ου̣σ̣[ιλάῳ
αὐτὰ]ρ̣ ὁ θυ̣μ̣[ὸν ἄϊσ]θε̣ κ̣α̣[ὶ ἤρυ- 20, 403-404
γεν] ὡ̣ς̣ [ὅ]τε τ̣α̣[ῦρος ἤ]ρ̣υγεν [ἑλκό-
μεν]ος Ἑλ̣ικῶν[ιον ἀμ]φὶ̣ς̣ [ἄνα-
κτα. Ν]ηλ̣εὺς ὁ Κ̣[ό]δρου κατὰ̣[
] Ἀ̣πόλλωνος ἔστ̣ε̣[ιλεν
ἀποικία]ν̣ ἀπό τε Ἀθηνῶ[ν καὶ

τῆc ᾿Αχαικ]ῆc ῾Ελίκηc εἰc Μ[ίλη-
τον]αcχων τῆc ἐκε̣[
ἱερὸν ἱδρ]ύ̣cατο Ποcειδῶ̣[*νοc καὶ*
῾Ελικῶν]ι̣ον *προcηγ̣όρε[υcε.*

1 Acusilaus suggested by Haslam || 2-4 ed. pr. wrongly prints: *αὐτὰρ] ὁ θυ̣μ̣[ὸν ἄϊc]θε̣ [καὶ | ἤρυγεν ὡ]c̣ [ὅ]τ̣ε τα̣[ῦροc] ἤ[ρυ]γ̣εν | ἑλκόμεν]οc ῾Ελ̣ικών[ι-ον ἀμ]φὶ ἄ̣[νακτα.* || 3 *pace* Luppe (*Eikasmos* 1996), the lower part of the left-hand curve of *ω* is visible right above *ο* in l. 4; perhaps *γε* instead of *γεν* (suggested by Luppe in a letter), and in 3-4 perhaps [*ἑλκόμε- | ν*]οc and [*ἄνακ-τα* instead of line-divisions shown in text || 4]*φὶ α̣*[ed. pr., but *α* cannot be read; c fits the traces better || 5 Ν]*ει-* || 8 sic ed. pr., but perhaps]α̣c (e.g. from ᾿Αχαΐ]α̣c; cf. sch. T 20, 403 *ἐν* ῾*Ελίκηι τῆc* ᾿Αχαΐαc) | *με̣[ι-*

Fr. 4 (21, 194)

. . . . . .
]c̣ *αυτου π̣[*
]*ρον κ̣ερα̣[*
]c *ουν οδ[*
] . ᾿Α*μαλθ[εια*
] . [] . [
. . . . . .

2 *κ̣ερα̣*[(cf. Haslam; Rossum) : . *ερδ*[ed. pr. ||] . [] . [, top of round letter followed by small space and high dot :] . . [ed. pr.

Fr. 5 + 6 + 52 (21, 448; 22, 29)
Col. I

. . . .
Φοῖβε, cὺ δ' εἰλίποδ]α̣c ἕ̣λ̣[ικα]c̣ β[οῦc
νό]μ̣ιον̣ ο . [. .] . α . [
βε]βλ̣ήκαc̣ι καθα
᾿Α*πολλόδ]ω̣ροc ἐνθένδε*
]θεωροῦντεc
] . *τοῦτ̣ον κατα*
] . *αντηνδεκα*
ἀ]λόγων ζῴ̣ων
] . *φηcὶν καὶ* ῞Ο*μη-*
ροc "οὐρῆαc μὲν πρῶ]τ̣ον [ἐπ]ῴ̣χετο
καὶ κύναc ἀργούc, αὐτ]ὰ̣ρ̣ ἔ̣π̣ε̣ι̣τ̣' αὐ-
τοῖcι βέλοc ἐχεπευκὲc ἐ]φ̣ι̣εὶc["
β]ο̣υλομεν̣[

]π̣ράγματοϲ[
] . ρρ̣ω̣[.]ενα
]θεὸν φύλα-
κα]ν̣ κατεϲτ . -
προϲα]γορεύϲαντεϲ
] . ω̣ν̣τ̣ω̣ν̣[
] . . [

. . . .

1 identified by Haslam; this line is positioned at the same height as l. 5 in col. II || 2 ο . [. .] . α . [, ο followed by upright; α preceded by a dot and followed by an upright with a small descending oblique, probably ν but ι cannot be excluded : οἱ [πα]λαι̣[οὶ Luppe (*An. Pap.*) || 5]θεο- || 6] . , one dot || 7] . , parts of slightly curved upright, resembles right leg of e.g. η, μ, ν, π :]ϲ̣ Luppe (*An. Pap.*) unlikely || 9] . , horizontal at bottom touching φ :]α̣ Luppe (*An. Pap.*) possible || 11-12 identified by Haslam || 12]ειϲ⟦β̣α̣⟧[(ed. pr. reads]ηϲ⟦β̣ ⟧[) || 15] . , round letter, perhaps ε, ο or ω :]ε̣ρρ̣ω̣[μ]έ-να Haslam : π]ὸρρ̣ω̣[θ]εν ἀ- Luppe (*An. Pap.*) || 17 ω̣- [ed. pr., but η[or ει[cannot be excluded

Col. II

νην . [
θ̣α̣φο . [
. . . [
τ̣ε̣ϲ̣ καὶ τ̣[
π̣α̣ρειμε̣[
] . . τ̣εϲυ̣[
. . ν̣ αὐτου̣[. .]τ . [
ἀπελάϲ̣η̣ τα . [
πάλοιϲ̣ π̣α̣ίο̣ν̣[τεϲ
κατὰ τὴν̣ ε . [
τε̣ϲεμεν̣[.] . [
κ̣αι . [. .]ηνδ[
. αντ̣[. . . .] . . [
. . ν̣[
.]ε̣ . [

. . . .

fr. 52
]ε̣ . . [
] . ν[
]ϲ ῥο-[
]ν̣αν̣[
]αν[
] . . [

1 ρ̣[ed. pr., but this upright may stem from more letters || 2 ο . [: ορ̣[ed. pr., but the trace after ο looks more like an upright with a stroke through it; above ο are traces from a correction: an upright and a dot || 6ff. Luppe's combination of fr. 52 with fr. 5 (cf. *ZPE* 29-33) is attractive in view of 8 ῥο- || 6] . . , curved trace at bottom (ε not likely) followed by upright with

small descending oblique, perhaps ν or μ : [.]α̣ . - ed. pr. : .]ε̣ν̣- Luppe ibid. | (fr. 52) . . [, first lower part of upright; second, ascending oblique : ευ> Luppe ibid. possible || 7 . . prob. ει or η before the ν : ηι̣ ἑ̣- Luppe ibid. cannot be read | [. .]τ . [not in ed. pr.; . [, ο or ω (not α, Luppe ibid.) | (fr. 52)] . , ο (ed. pr.) or ω || 8 τα⟦ε⟧[ed. pr., but perhaps ταθ̣[|| 8-9 ῥο- | πάλοις παίον̣[τες αὐτὸν ἀπέκτει]ν̣αν Luppe ibid. || 10 ἕω̣[Luppe ibid. possible || 11 there is a thin stroke through τ and perhaps through the second letter, which may be ε or ο; it is uncertain whether this stroke is meaningful or not |] . [part of round letter | fr. 52] . . [, top of oblique trace followed by high dot and small hooked trace, perhaps top of ε? : ἐμέμ̣ν̣[ηντο and fr. 52]τ̣ο̣[Luppe ibid. cannot be read || 12]η ed. pr., but perhaps ει : καὶ δ[ίκ]ην δ[εδιότες Luppe ibid. possible || 14 . ην̣[ed. pr. but η uncertain, perhaps μ || 15 ε̣τ̣[ed. pr.

Fr. 7 (22, 29)

. . . .
]α̣η[
τῆ]ς̣ Χ[
ὅν τε κυν' Ὠ]ρ̣ίω̣ν̣[ος 22, 29
] . . [
. . . .

this fr. stems from the lower part of the first column of frr. 5 + 6 (cf. Luppe 29) || 3]ρ̣ειω̣ν̣[: not] . ηω̣ . [ed. pr. || 4]εφ[Luppe (*ZPE* 29) : φ seems possible, instead of ε perhaps υ

Fr. 8 (23, 92)

. . . . .
]υ . [
]υειc̣[.] . ν̣[
φι]λοφρόνω[c
]δ̣ε̣ παρ' Ἡφ[αίcτου
ἀμφορ]ε̣α χρυcο[ῦν
] . γενομ̣[
]ν̣α . . οι . [
Θέτ]ιδ[ι.] ἡ δ[ὲ τῷ
παιδὶ ἐ]χαρίcατ̣[ο
]α̣ποθη[
(space)
] . . [
. . . . .

Fr. 9 (23, 92?)

. . . . .
]τον̣[.] . [
]ο̣υνομ̣[
]ο̣υργο̣[
]θηθ . π̣[
]αc̣τα̣[
. . . . .

this fr. may belong to fr. 1+2, cf. Luppe (*Prom.* n. 1)

1 . [, lower part of upright (-ς̣[- Luppe *Prom.* does not fit) || 2] . , low dot :

εἰc [τ]ὴν Luppe possible || 6] . , ο or ω (ν Luppe ibid. cannot be read) : ἐν Νάξ]ῳ ed. pr. || 7 -]ν ἀμοιβ[ὴν Luppe ibid. compatible with traces

Fr. 10 (23, 141-142; 346-347)

] . ον γένεcιν . [
]ομενοι δια τ[
]οροc το[ῖ]c πρ[
]cωcιν[]ε . . [
Ἀχ]ιλλεὺc τω . [
]εἰκότωc γ . [
]ἐκ Φαρcάλ[ο]υ[
] . αι ἐν[τε]ῦθεν ὁ ποταμ[ὸc
]αc ἔχει. ἡ δ' ἱcτορία παρὰ [τοῖc Θετ-
τ]αλικὰ c[υ]γγράψαcι
οὐδ' ε]ἴ κεν μετόπιcθεν [Ἀρίονα δῖ- 23, 346-347
ο]ν ἐλαύνοι Ἀδρήcτου τ[αχὺν ἵππον
ὃc ἐκ θεόφιν γένοc ἦεν . [
Ποcειδῶνα ἐραcθέντα Τιλ[φω-
cαίηc τῆc Ἐρινύοc ἵππῳ ἀπεικ[α-
cθέντα μιγῆναι αὐτῇ ἐν Ἁλιάρ-
τ]ῳ τῆc Βοιωτίαc. τὴν δ' ἔγκυον[
γ]ενηθεῖcαν ἵππον γεννῆcαι ω[
. ()]κο . [.]ν. τοῦτον δὲ διὰ τὸ κράτε[ιc-
το]ν [εἶναι Ἀ]ρίονα κληθῆναι. τὸ[ν δὲ
Κοπρέα Ἁλι]άρτου βαcιλέα . [
λαβεῖν αὐ]τὸν παρὰ Πο[cειδῶνοc
]δὲ Κοπρέα[
πα]ραχωρηcα[
]επ . [
] . [

. . . .

1] . , two dots one above the other | . [, γ or π || 3 οροcτοcπρ[ed. pr. || 4][. .]`cω´cιν- | after ε prob. π || 5 . [, low left part of a curve, α? || 6 γ . [, γ followed by top left part of a curve : π[Luppe (*ZPE* 25-28) impossible || 8ff. lineation in ed. pr. not correct || 9] . . . χει. [ἡ] ed. pr. :]α ἔcχε. ἡ Luppe ibid. cannot be read || 9-10 Θετ | ταλικα Haslam | c[υ]ν- || 13 . [, λ or μ, prob. from λ[έγεται or λ[έγουcι(ν) (Luppe ibid.) || 15]c[ε]`αι´ | ε-ρει- || 17 ενκυ- || 19 ]κ or perhaps ]χ; ο followed by bottom of round letter : -]δρομ[- Luppe ibid. impossible | κρατε[ιc- fits the traces better than κρα-τι[c- ed. pr. || 20 ]ρει- || 21 . [, low flat trace || 23 κοπρ[ . ]`ε´α || 25 . [, upright || 26 high dot

Fr. 11 (23, 683; 24, 24)

. . . .
να τούτ̣[ων Ὄρσιππον ?
μα ἐμπο̣[δισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ περι-
ζώματο̣ς̣ [πεσεῖν καὶ τελευ-
τῆσαι· ὅθεν[
εἰσηγης̣α̣ς̣[
τους επα[ἡ
δ̲' ἱστορία π[αρὰ
τ[ῆς] Ω̣[
κλέψαι δ' ὀτ̣[ρύ]ν[εσκον ἐΰσκοπον 24, 24
'Αργε]ιφόντην. Δία̣ [ἐρασθέν-
τα Μ̣αίας τῆς 'Ατλα̣[ντίδος
τε γὰρ καὶ σωφρ̣ο[
ἀδελφὰς μιγῆ[ναι
] . τὸν δ' 'Ε̣ρ̣μ̣[ῆν ἐν Κυλλήνῃ
τῆς] 'Αρκαδ[ί]α̣[ς
]α̣ιτοκ[
]ονιο . [
] . η μητ̣[ρ μετὰ
τῶν] ἀ̣δελφ[ῶν αὐτῆς λουο-
μένη]ν̣ λαθ̣[

1-4 on this text, cf. Rossum; for more supplements in 1-20, cf. Luppe *Hyperboreus* || 2 εντο[|| 8 τ[. . .] . [ed. pr. || 14] . , dot || 18] . high dot, perhaps τ

Fr. 12 (24, 602)

. . . . .
]α̣ν̣[.] . . [
μ]ετα̣βα̣λ̣[
] . μέχρι̣[
Φ]ρ̣υγ̣ία[
]π̣ο . [
]χ̣ε . [
] . δα̣ . [
. . . . .

Fr. 13

. . . . .
]μ̣ον λογω . [
]τ̣ρωσινερ . [
]α̣υτου . απ[
] . αδικη[.]τ . [
]c . [
. . . . .

3]α̣ ed. pr., but perhaps λ̣ | . perhaps c

Fr. 14

. . .
]κετοε̣[
]. τηθερ . [
]. οcων . [
]ρ̣εφρυ . . [
]α̣τacκε . [
]λεψεκε̣[
]. cνεκρο[
]εοι̣κ̣ε . [
]ην . [
. . .

Fr. 15

. . .
]. . . . [.] . . . [
]αντων αὐτ̣[
]. ηcθαι cυνε̣[
]μα ὕδατα δ[
]. c λέγεcθαι̣[

3 ε̣[, θ also possible

Fr. 16 (20, 53)

. . . .
] ≻—[
] [τῆc Υ
] ἀλλ̣[οτε παρ' Cιμόεντι θέων ἐπὶ 20, 53
] Κα[λλικολώνῃ
] λο . [
]] [
] δε . [
]α Ἰλι . [
]. α̣ι̣ μη[
] μο[
] εντ̣[
]δετ[
]δ̣ε[
. . . .

9 perhaps] . ν̣ || col. ii 2-4 supplevi || 5 λοφ[ον Haslam, or ὑψη- | λόc̣[? || 6 (vac.)[ed. pr., but the original letters are probably lost in the gap || 8 ἴλ- || 13]δ̣, but λ also possible

Fr. 17

. . . . .
]νηγι̣και̣δ̣[
]ατουcυν̣[
]ωcτην . [
]απωλεια[
]δραμου[

Fr. 18

. . . . .
] . [
ων̣[
αιτι̣[
τρα̣πη[
β̣η̣ντ[

]πεπλου̣[
]ατροc[
] ̣ ακρε[
] ̣ τ̣υχ[
. . . .

ωτου̣[
ταπη ̣ [
μηcα[
αν ̣ [
cφυ̣[
. . . .

1 stroke through γικα meaningful?

Fr. 19

. . .
(space)
]κα ̣ [
]τοc ̣ [
] ̣ ομα[
]ν̣ηcκη[
]και ̣ απ[
]λλου̣cα̣[
]νδυ̣νη̣[

1][[ν]]κα ̣ [; 1ff. for some attempts at identification cf. Rossum || 2 ̣ [, π (ed. pr.) or γ || 4 not] ̣ ηcχη[ed. pr. || 5 ̣ , low dot and high oblique, probably κ :]κατ̣απ[ed. pr.

Fr. 20

] ̣ ̣ θ̣[̣] ̣ ν̣[
]α̣ζ̣ε̣τ̣ ̣ καταπ̣[
] ̣ cα ̣ οτον̣[
]περι πυ̣κτικ̣[ηc
] α̣υτο ̣ [
] ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ [
. . . .

1 ν̣[: η[ed. pr. ||
2 εβι]αζετο Haslam ||
4 suppl. Haslam

Fr. 21

. . .
] ̣ ̣ [
]cκαλ[
]cιcυν̣[
] ̣ ταcδ[
]ποτεω̣[
] ̣ αυτα[
]τ̣ ̣ ν̣θ̣[
. . .

4] ̣ upright || 7 ̣ , ω̣ ed. pr. but η more probable

Fr. 22

. . .
]ωνο[
] ̣ ηνδ[
]εβου ̣ [
] ̣ οταξ̣[
]α̣ρα ̣ [

3][[̣]]εβου ̣ [

Fr. 23

. . .

ἀρ]μ̣οζο . [
]ν̣γαρη[
]ναδε[
]ε̣πεμψ[
] . αταc̣[
] . [

. . .

Fr. 24 (22, 126)

. . . .

] . [
ἡ δ' ἱcτ]ο̣ρία>[
παρὰ]
οὐ μέν πως νῦν ἔcτιν ἀπ]ὸ̣ δρυ-
ὸc οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρηc] . τιc
]τη
] . . τ̣[

. . . .

Fr. 24 1] . [, probably ε or c || 2]ο̣ρία π̣[αρὰ ed. pr., but cf. Haslam || 5] . ,]η ed. pr. but]ε̣ι̣ also possible || 7 τ̣[: π̣[ed. pr.

Fr. 25

. . .

] . τοιc̣[
] . ομε̣[
]ε̣υcτ̣[
]ο̣νη . [
]ωμ . [
]ε̣cεκ[
] . . [

. . .

Fr. 26 does not belong to this collection of fragments, for it is written in a different hand.

Fr. 27

. .

]ρ . [
]ο . [
]ενλ̣[
]ε̣κτρ[
] . ρθη[
]α̣cα . [

1 . [, small curved stroke

Fr. 28

. .

]ηχη[
] . ουν̣[
]cμε̣[
]ντο[
] . ου[
] . η . [
] . πο[

. .

7] . high dot

Fr. 29

. . .

δ[
θρ[
μ . [
οψ̣[
λ̣[
κ̣[
c[
. [

. . .

Fr. 30

. . .

]νε . [
] . φαν . [

Fr. 31

. .

] . λ̣α . [
]ων̣[

Fr. 32

. . .

]ν̣α[
]ω . [

] . γυν[
] . ντα . [
]αδε . [
] . . [
. . .

1 . [, upright || 2] . , ο̣ ed. pr., but ν̣ seems more likely

] . αcε . [
]υ̣πο̣ . [
] . . . [
. .

1] . , low trace

]ε̣ρωτ̣[
]ω̣που̣[
. . .

2 . [, α (ed. pr.) or δ?

Fr. 33

. . .
] . . .()[
] . ι̣και . [
]α̣ποδ[
]λ̣ον[
]πω . [
. . .

2] . ι is probably α̣ι̣ or ν | . [, high dot

Fr. 34

. . .
] . . . . [
]προλειπ̣[
]cθαι γὰρ[
]ειτου[
. . .

1 . . [, probably ν̣ε̣[

Fr. 35

] . τα αλλ[
]δ̣ αυτα̣[
] . π . [
. . .

3] . high dot | . [, round letter (ed. pr. ο̣)

Fr. 36

. .
] . [
] . [
] δ[
] τ̣[
] κ[
. .

Fr. 37

. .
] . [
]τ̣α . [
]υ̣τ̣ . . [
]εc̣ε̣τ̣ι̣[

2 . [, perhaps δ? ||
3] . . . . [ed. pr.

Fr. 38

. . .
] . [
] . κη . [
]θαιδα̣[
4]ε̣ι̣cε̣ ʼΙ̣λ̣[
. . .

2] . , perhaps ω ||
4 ϊλ[

Fr. 39

. .
] . [
] . πω[
]ονο[
]ν̣τα[
]α̣πα̣[
. .

Fr. 40

. . . .
] . εcθαι . [
] . εωc̣[
]ε̣ν̣τ̣[
. .

1] . vertical |
. [, α̣ ed. pr., but λ also possible

Fr. 41

. .
]να[
]αcαι̣[
3]ακα[
(space)
] . . . [
. .

3 a subscription with Callimachus is most likely, cf. Haslam

Fr. 42

. .
] . [
]υτοι . [
] . ινε . [
] . [
. .

Fr. 43

. .
] . . . [
] . ϲ̣ . . [
]νοϲ[
] . . α̣ν̣[
] . θ̣ . [
. .

1] . . . [, dot; curve; small angle :]ο̣ . [ed. pr. || 2]ο̣ϲ̣ . ν̣[ed. pr.

Fr. 44

. .
]πι . [
]μεν[
]α̣τε . [
] . ενε[
] . τω[
] . . . [
. . .

6 high curve; top of α or λ; small oblique :] . α̣[ed. pr.

Fr. 45

. . .
] . [. . .] . εξε[
]κ̣ ἐπι̣δραμ . [
]α̣ϲθα̣[
. .

2 . [, ο (ed. pr.) or ω

Fr. 46

. .
] . . . [
] . παρ[
] . νε . [

2] . :]η ed. pr. || 3 . [, γ, τ (ed. pr.) or π

Fr. 47

. .
] . ρ̣ακ̣[
]με . [
] . ου[
] . . χ . [
. .

Fr. 48

. .
]ε̣[
]ε[
]π . [
] . ω̣[
] . ιτ̣[
] . ο . [
]α . [
]ατ̣[
] . ε[
]υ̣ν̣[
] . . [
]α[
. .

Fr. 49

. .
] . [
]μ̣[
] . α[
]α̣ϲ[
]τ̣ε̣[
]χρι̣[
]ν[
. .

Fr. 50

. .
]ε̣ν . [
]θα[
]ηϲ[
]ε [
]με[
]ει[
] . ν . [
. .

5]α̣ιτ̣[ed. pr. || 6 for a possible identification (ll. 1-6 cf. *historia* on *Il.* 24, 251; 7ff. cf. quotation of *Il.* 24, 602 and *historia*) see Rossum || 10]υ̣ . [ed. pr. || 11] . , ο or ω (ed. pr.)

Fr. 51

. .
] . [
] . α . [
]ε̣φυ̣[
]ω[
]τη[
] . . [
. .

2 . [, τ (ed. pr.) or υ

Fr. 52
cf. frr. 5 + 6

Fr. 53

. .
]αιτ̣[
]νδ[
] . α . [
(space)
]ρ̣η . [
. .

3] . , high dot | . [, γ (ed. pr.) or π ||
5 . [, vertical : ν̣ ed. pr

Fr. 54

. . .
]ω̣c
]ην
]α̣c
]η
. . .

Fr. 55

. .
]υ̣cτ̣[
] . cθα̣[
] . δα . [
. .

Fr. 56

. .
]ε̣ . [
]πoκν̣[
3] . . εο̣ . [
. .

3]χε̣c̣ . [ed. pr., but χ (or υ) is preceded by a high dot and instead of c̣, I discern the upper part of ο (or perhaps θ)

Fr. 57

] . . . [
]υcτ . [
] . ι̣ . [
. .

2 . [round letter : ο̣ ed. pr. ||
3 . [, α, δ (ed. pr.) or λ

Fr. 58

. .
]ηδ[
] . θα[
] . αλ̣ . [
. .

Fr. 59

. .
]αι̣
]ε

Fr. 60

. .
] . . α̣[
]α̣χ . [

Fr. 61

. .
]ηδ[
(space)

Fr. 62

. .
] . . [
]ην[

] . ει . [
] . . . [

3] . ας . [

] . ω[

3 . [, α (ed. pr.) or ω ?; for possible identifications, cf. Haslam (*Il.* 23, 141?) and Rossum (*Il.* 20, 146?)

1 lower curve of round letter and an upright :]ν . [ed. pr. || 3] . upright, e.g. ι (ed. pr.) or ν

Fr. 63

] . . . ε . [
]ναιρ . [
] . [

Fr. 64

]ρα[

Fr. 65

] υπ[
] εcτ[
] . [

3 dot

Fr. 65 may not belong to this collection of fragments: the υ and perhaps the ε are written differently, but this fr. is too small to settle this issue

Fr. 66

] . . . [
] . ο . [
] . ατ[

Fr. 67

]οτε[
] . πε[

2] . , high dot

Fr. 68

]κλ[
]εω[
] . ω[
]ζ . [

1] . . [ed. pr. || 4]ζη[ed. pr.

Fr. 69

] ο[
] π . [

Fr. 70

] . [
]ου[
]ατ[

Fr. 71

] . [
]α . [

Fr. 72

] . αρ[
] .()[

2 π (ed. pr.) or τι?

Fr. 73

]α . [
]ηδ[
] . ο . [

1 . [, left part of curve

Fr. 74

] . [
] . α . [
] . [

Fr. 75

. .
] . το . [
] . [
. .

Fr. 76

. .
] . αϲ̣[
]κ . [
. .

Fr. 77

. .
] . [
] . [
. .

54 *P.Berol.* inv. 13930 (*P.Schub.* 21) ?, V

ed. pr. W. Schubart, *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, Berlin 1950, no. 21, 45-47
identified by R. Merkelbach, *APF* 16, 1956, 117-118
cf. Pack 1203; W. Luppe, *APF* 31, 1985, 5-11 + pl. 1; Montanari (1984)
* inspexi

Contents: MH *Il.* 19, 326 Achilles on Scyros (ll. 1-15); ? (ll. 16); 20, 53 Callicolone (ll. 17-23); -, 147 Zeus and Apollo (ll. 24-28)

→

. . . .
]κ̣α̣ι̣ϲ
]ἐ̣ξ̣έ̣π̣ε̣ϲ̣ε χρη-
] . ε̣ν̣ οὖν ἐξέπεμ-
ψ] . . λόγον̣ ἀξιώϲονταϲ
'Αχι]λ̣λ̣έ̣α̣ ν . . . [ ]θείαϲ 'Οδυϲ-
ϲεὺϲ]ε̣π̣ι̣ζ̣ητ̣ηϲ . α̣[. .]ράπηϲαν αὐ-
] . π̣αρ . [.] . ο̣ην δὲ ὅτ̣ι π̣αρὰ Λυκ̣ομ[ή-
δ . . .]υ̣[. . . .]ν ἐπ̣ὶ̣ Cκῦρον παρεγένοντ̣[ο.
. ε̣νοι Λυκομήδουϲ ἠξίουν [
ἐπιδεῖξαι̣[. . .] . γνο . . . [
οἰκίαι τρεφόμεν̣ . [] . . [
ϲαϲ δὲ 'Οδυϲϲεὺϲ . . . . [
.] . ρειτο ἐπιτρεφ[
]νοπ . [
] . [
. . . .

3] . ε̣ν̣ : μ̣ὲ̣ν̣ ed. pr. : πο]λ̣εμ̣οῦν cannot be read, *pace* Luppe ‖ 4]λ̣ό̣γο̣ν̣ κτλ. ed. pr. : υ]ἱ̣[ο]ῦ̣ λόγον κτλ. Luppe ‖ 5 'Αχι]λ̣λ̣έ̣α̣ τ̣ῆ̣ϲ̣ Luppe |]λ̣λ̣εαν . . . [ἀλη]θείαϲ ed. pr. : or e.g. [βοη]θείαϲ? ‖ 6 sic ed. pr., I can only read επι and ρα . ηϲαναυ with certainty : ϲεὺϲ καὶ Διομήδηϲ] ἐπὶ ζήτηϲ[ι]ν̣ [ἐτ]ράπηϲαν αὐ- Luppe ‖ 7] . ε̣π̣αρϲ̣[.]χοην ed. pr. :]ϲ̣. π̣αρ' [ἀ]κ̣οὴν Luppe | Λυκομή- Luppe ‖ 8 -γέν̣ο[ν]τ̣[ο ed. pr. ‖ 9 rather μ̣ε̣νοι ed. pr. than θ̣ε̣νοι Luppe ‖

10 -ξ[ι]ν[Luppe, also possible |]ọυν . . . . . [ed. pr. :]ἀγνοẹῖṇ[Luppe || 11 τρεφομεν . . . [ed. pr. : τρεφόμεṇ[ο]ṇ π̣α̣[Luppe || 12 . . α̣ρ̣[ed. pr. fits the traces || 13 . .]ρ̣εῖτο ed. pr. || 14 . [, α̣ (ed. pr.) or λ̣ (Luppe) || 15] . [om. ed. pr.

↓

. . . .

πα̣ρ̣α̣ . ()[
ἄλλοτε παρ' Ϲιμ[όεντι θέων ἐπὶ Καλλικολώνῃ· ἔϲτι δὲ
Καλλικολώνη τό̣[ποϲ ἐν Ἰλίῳ λόφοϲ ὑψη-
λόϲ, τὸ περίμετρον ε . . . [ϲταδίων κεῖϲθαι δὲ
ϲυμβέβηκ̣[εν με]τα̣ξὺ [Ϲιμοῦντοϲ καὶ τῆϲ ἀντὶ Ἰλίου ?
πόλεωϲ κώμ[ηϲ· ὀνομάζε]ται μὲν ο̣ὖ[ν Καλλικολώνη,
ἐπεὶ] τ̣ῶν π̣[έριξ] τό̣πω̣ṇ [ἐπιϲημότατόϲ ἐϲτιν.
ἡ δὲ ἱϲτορία] παρὰ Δημητρ[ίῳ] τ[ῷ] Ϲκηψίῳ̣[.
18] . . . .
20] . . . νιοϲ . . [. . . . . .]ϲ . ευϲ παραϲτ[
30]ρ̣αο καὶ Ἀπολλω[
30 δ]εϲμοῖϲ ἠϲφαλιϲμ[έν-
32]ν προϲέταξ[εν
35]ϲυμπ[

. . . .

16 . . . . α̣ . [ed. pr. || 17-23 supplements according to Merkelbach || 17 π̣α̣ρ̣ . . [ed. pr. : παρ'[Merkelbach || 18 sic Merkelbach, but I cannot read ọ[|| 19 ἐλῶν[ed. pr. || 20 sic Merkelbach :] . . . τ̣ο̣ξ̣υ̣ν̣ρ̣[ed. pr. : I discern only] . ọξυ . . [|| 22 sic Merkelbach : [. . . .]πων τ̣α̣ . . . τειποι . . . . ed. pr. : I discern only] . ωντο̣ . .()εριτο . . . . . . || 23 Ϲκηψ[ίῳ Merkelbach || 24 only vague traces || 26 sic ed. pr. : I can discern only ολ with certainty

55 *P.Berol.* inv. 13282 — Hermopolis, III

ed. pr. W. Müller, *Forschungen und Berichte* 10, Berlin 1968, 118-119
re-ed. by F. Montanari, *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*, Napoli 1984, 2. 229-242 (= Montanari 1995 *Studi* : 113-125)
cf. W. Luppe, *Eikasmos* 7, 1996, 207-210 (on ll. 9-17)
* inspexi; text based on re-ed.

Contents: MH *Il.* 20, 147 Laomedon and Heracles (ll. 1-8); -, 307 Aeneas (ll. 9-10); -, 403-404 Heliconion (ll. 11-16)

→

. . . .

29]τ̣ο̣ῦ̣ κή̣τ̣ο̣υ̣c
22 το]ῦ̣ θ̣ηρίου τὸν θεόν
22]τ̣ὰ πλευρὰ καὶ οὕτωc
25]τε ἀναρπάcῃ τὴν
20 τὸ]ν Λαομέδοντα καρπω
22 τὴ]ν̣ θυγατέρα μηδου
23 ʽΗ]ρ̣ακλεῖ τὸ ἔπαθλο(ν)
27 ἔ]ν̣θεν δ̣οῦναι

. . . .

7 -αθλο̅

↓

. . . .

. . απλ . . [τὴν τῶν Πρια-
μιδῶν ἀρχήν. ἡ [(δ') ἱcτορία παρὰ ʼΑκουcιλάῳ (?)
***αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἄιc̣θ[ε καὶ ἤρυγεν, ὡc ὅτε ταῦροc ἤρυ-
γεν ἑλκόμενοc ʽΕ̣λικώ̣ν[ιον ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα*** Νηλεὺc ὁ
Κ̣όδρου μα[ν]τεία[ν λαβὼν ἔcτειλεν ἀποικίαν ἀπό τε
ʼΑθηνῶν καὶ τ[ῆ]c[ʼΑχαικῆc ʽΕλίκηc
τῆc γῆc ἱερὸν Π̣[οcειδῶνοc ἱδρύcατο καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ
ἐν τῇ ʼΑχαικ̣[ῇ ʽΕλίκῃ τεμένουc ʽΕλικώνιον προcη-
. [ ] . [

. . . .

9 τ̣ῇ ἀπλοί[ᾳ̣ ed. pr. : τῇ ἀπλότ[ητι Luppe (*Eikasmos*) || **13** κονδρ- | suppl. ἔcτειλεν κτλ. according to pap. **53** : λαβὼν ἀποικίαν ἔcτειλεν ἐξ Montanari || **14** τ[ῆ]c [ʼΑχαικῆc ʽΕλίκηc, cf. **53** fr. 3; hereafter Schubert (ed. pr. **53**) suppl. καὶ ἀναcχὼν and Luppe (op. cit.) εἰc Μίλητον. ἐπὶ δὲ || **15** sic Montanari, but τ[(ed. pr.) suits the traces better || **16** ʼΑχαίᾳ̣[ed. pr., both readings are possible || **17** under the first ε and second α of l. 16 are vague traces of letters : ρ]ε̣[υcεν Luppe (op. cit.)

56 *PSI* 10, 1173 ?, III

ed. pr. G. Coppola, *Papiri greci e latini* 10, Firenze 1932, 131-140
cf. Pack 1209; R. Pfeiffer, *Philologus* 92, 1937, 14-16
* my remarks are based on examination of photographs.

Contents: MH *Od.* 3, 4 Pylos (ll. 1-10); -, 91 Amphitrite (ll. 11-13); ? Telemachus (ll. 14-25); 11, 321 Phaedra (ll. 26-28); -, 321

Procris (ll. 29-51); -, 322 Ariadne and Theseus (ll. 52-64); -, 326 Maera (ll. 65-77); -, 326 Clymene (ll. 77 end-81); -, 326 Eriphyle (ll. 82-102); -, 519 Eury-pylus (ll. 103-106); -, 582 Tantalus (ll. 107-116); 12, 70 Argo and Jason (ll. 117-146); -, 85 Scylla (ll. 147-156); 13, 96 Phorcys (ll. 157-171); -, 259 Idomeneus (ll. 172-176); 14, 327 Dodona (ll. 177-187)

Fr. 1 → (3, 4; -, 91)

. . . .

]μεταλα[
] . ντηϲ πελ[
]δε δọντων̣[
] . ρουντω[
]ϲ τὴν Πύλ[ον
]νεπομεν̣[
ἔγ]ημε Χλωρί[δα
]ẹξ ἧϲ αὐτῶι κ[
]το. ἡ δὲ ἱϲτορ[ία
<u>παρὰ ʼΕλλανί]κωι</u>
εἴ τε καὶ ἐν π]ελάγει με[τὰ κύμα-
ϲιν ʼΑμφιτρί]τηϲ· ἐν τῃ[
] . . . ()[

. . . .

2 "Pelias Z. 2 ist sicher" Pfeiffer, 15, but also possible is e.g. εἰϲ Μεϲϲήν]ην τῆϲ Πελ[οποννήϲου, cf. Σ *Od.* 11, 281 where the story is related more extensively than in 3, 4 || 4] . , perhaps α || 7 ἔγ]ημε : ἔγημε δ]ὲ Χλωρί[δα ed. pr. and suppl. by Pfeiffer || 9 ἴϲτ- || 10, 12 suppl. Pfeiffer (cf. Pfeiffer for more supplements in 5-9)

Fr. 1 ↓

. . . .

] . τη . . . [
] . οϲ ʼΟδυϲϲέω̣[ϲ
]υϲιωϲ ουχ[
] . οϲ θαλαϲϲ[
]υ ζῆν αὐτ[
]νεψαι τὴν . [
] . Τηλέμαχοϲ κ[
]ịϲ ὑβρίϲαι τον̣[
]ọυ μητέρα α[
]τ̣ῶι ἔργωι δὲ[

]ευcεν οκα[
] . . [

. . . .

14 perhaps] . τηcιν[|| 17] . , upright :]ι ed. pr.

Fr. 2 → (11, 321)

. . . .

φαν]εράc γεν[ο]μένη[c τῆc διαβο-
λ]ῆc ἀναρτηθῆνα[ι. ἡ δὲ ἱcτορί-
α] παρὰ ᾿Αcκληπιάδηι.
Πρ]όκριν. Κέφαλ[ο]c ὁ Δηϊ[ονέωc
γή]μαc Πρόκριν τὴν ᾿Ερεχ[θέωc
κα]τῴκει ἐν Θορικῶι. θέλων [δὲ
τῆc γ]υναικὸc ἀποπειρᾶcθαι ἀ[-
πο]δημεῖ ἐπ᾿ ἔτη ὀκτὼ καταλ[ι-
πὼ]ν αὐτὴν ἔτι νύμφην. [ἔπει-
τα κατ]ακοcμήcαc ἑαυτὸν κ[αὶ
ἀλλ]οιώ[cα]c ἔρχεται[
εἰc τὴν οἰκία]ν ἔχων κ[όcμον
] . . [

. . . .

29 κελαφαλ[ο]c || 33 επ᾿ || 34 ετει || 36 ερχεταιερχ[

Fr. 2 ↓ (11, 321)

. . . .

. . . .] . . . . [. .]προcα[
. . . .]αυρα γένοιτο καὶ τ[οῦ-
το μόνον c]υνειδέναι αὐτῷ· ἡ [δὲ
Πρόκριc] ἀκούcαcα ἔρχεται ε[ἰc
ταύτ]ην τὴν κορυφὴν καὶ κατα[κρύπτε-
τ]αι καὶ κατακούουcα αὐτο[ῦ
τοῦτο λέγοντοc προcτρέχ[ει
ὡc αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Κέφαλοc ἐξ[αίφ-
νηc ἰδὼν ταύτην ἔξ[ω αὐτοῦ
γί]νεται καὶ ὡc εἶδε βάλλ[ει ἀκον-
τί]ῳ τὴν Πρόκριν κ[αὶ κτεί-
νε]ι. μεταπεμψάμεν[οc δὲ τὸν
᾿Ερεχ]θέα τα . [

. . . .

43 \την/ || 47 ϊδων

Fr. 3 → (11, 322)

. . . .

λάβῃ κρατήcαντά τε τῆ[c κεφα-
λ]ῆc καὶ τῶν τριχῶν cφ[άξαι τῷ
Π]οcειδῶνι ο κ̣ . . . . . [.] . υcαι[
.] . ελίττοντα. ὁ δὲ [Θηc]εὺc [ἀκού-
c]αc ταῦτα λαμβάνε[ι τ]ὴν [᾿Αριά-
δ]νην ἀφικνεῖταί τε εἰ[c ᾿Αθή-
ν]αc. cυντόμωc δὲ διαν̣[αcτὰc
τ]ο̣ῦτο ποιεῖ˙ ἀφειμέν[ηc δὲ τῆc
᾿Αρ]ιάδνηc ᾿Αφροδίτη ταύ[τῃ πα-
ραc]τ̣ᾶcα θαρρεῖν παρῄν[ει˙ Διόνυ-
cο]ν̣ γὰρ αὐτῇ μίcγεcθα[ι καὶ εὐ-
κλ]ε̣ῆ γενέcθαι ἔλεγεν. [ὅθεν ὁ
θεὸc] φανε[ὶc μ]ίcγεται [αὐτῇ

. . . .

54 ποcι- | instead of ο, perhaps middle stop || 55] . ελιτ'τοντα | [ἀκού- ed. pr., but ποιή- for instance would also fit || 57 \τε/ εἰ[c || 59 ποιει˙ | δὲ om. ed. pr. || 60-61 πα- | ραc]τᾶcα ed. pr., but perhaps ἐπι- | φαν]ε̣ῖ̣cα (cf. codd.) can be read

Fr. 3 ↓ (11, 326)

. . . .

ἡγουμέ]νη δ[ὲ] π̣ε̣ρ̣[ὶ πλείονοc τὴν
παρθε]νείαν εἵπετο τῇ ᾿Αρ̣[τέ-
μιδι ἐπ]ὶ τὰc κυνηγεcίαc. τα[ύ-
τηc] ἐρα[cθεὶ]c̣ Ζεὺc ἀφικνε[ῖ-
ται] ὡc αὐτὴν καὶ λαθὼν φ[θεί-
ρει˙ ἔγκ]υοc δὲ γενηθεῖcα τίκ̣[τει
Λοκρὸ]ν τὸ ὄνομα, ὃc Θήβαc [με-
τὰ ᾿Α]μ̣φίονοc καὶ Ζήθου κ̣[τί-
ζει. τὴ]ν δὲ Μαῖραν λέγεται [ὑπὸ
᾿Αρτέμι]δοc τοξευθῆναι δι[ὰ τὸ
μηκέτι] παραγίνεcθαι εἰc [τὰ κυ-
νηγέcι]α̣. ἡ δὲ ἱcτορία παρὰ [Φε-
ρεκύ]δηι. Κλυ[μένην

. . . .

75 παραγει- || 76 ϊcτ- || 77]δ̣ει

Fr. 4 → (11, 326)

. . . .

δὲ] α̣ὐτὴν τὴν Κλ[υμένην προ- γαμη]θῆναί φασιν ὑφ'[Ἡλίου ἐξ ἧc Φαέθ]ων ἐγένε[το] παῖc. ἡ δὲ [ἱcτο- ρί]α παρ' Ἡcιόδωι.

cτυγερὴν γ' Ἐριφύλην· Ἀμφ[ιάρα- οc γήμαc Ἐριφύλην τὴν Ταλ[αοῦ καὶ διενεχθεὶc ὑπέρ τινων π̣ρ̣[ὸc Ἄ- δραcτον, καὶ π̣ά̣λιν διαλυθ[εὶc ὤ- μνυεν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν διαφ[έρων- τ̣αι πρὸc ἀλλήλουc αὐτόc τε κ[αὶ Ἄδρα- cτοc ἐπιτρέψειν Ἐριφύλη[ν κρί- νειν καὶ πειcθήcεcθαι αὐτῇ· [μετὰ δὲ τα]ῦ̣τ̣α̣ γενο̣μ̣[έ]νηc τῆc ἐπὶ Θή[βαc cτρατείαc ὁ μὲν Ἀ]μφιάρα[οc ἀπέ- τρεπε τοὺc Ἀργείουc] καὶ τὸ[ν

. . . .

79 ὑ̈φ[|| 82 -λην• || 86 ὕπερ || 89 πιc- || 90 τῆc add. ed. pr. || 92 τρεπε sch. : τρεψε ed. pr.

Fr. 4 ↓ (11, 326; -, 519)

. . . .

πρ]ὶν ἀποκτεῖν[α]ι τ[ὴν μητέ- ρα.] ταῦτα δὲ πάντα δρᾶ[cαι λέ- γ]εται τὸν Ἀλκ[μαίωνα καὶ] διὰ τὴν μητροκτονίαν̣[μα]νῆναι. τοὺc δὲ θεοὺc ἀκού- cα]νταc τῆc νόcου μεταλλά[- ξαι] διὰ τὸ ὁcίωc ἐπαμύνον- τα] τῷ πατρὶ τὴν μητέρα ἀπο- κτε]ῖναι. ἡ δ' ἱcτορία παρὰ Ἀcκλη[- πι]άδηι.

τὸν] Τηλεφίδην· Εὐρύπυλοc ὁ Τηλ]έφου καὶ Ἀcτυόχηc Ἡρακλέ[- α πά]ππον εχ[ ]ἀρχὴ[ν

. . . .

95]εταιδε{παρα}τον || 97]νηναι{δε}τουc\δε/θεουc || 98 νηcου || 101 δ' ἴcτ- || 105]π'πον

Fr. 5 → (11, 582; 12, 70)

. . . .
συνδι]ατρίβων τοῖc θ[εοῖc καὶ συν-
ε]cτιώ̣μενος ἀπλήcτ̣[ωc διετέθη.
κλέψαc γὰρ τὸ νέκταρ κα[ὶ τὴν ἀμ-
β]ροcίαν, οὐκ ἐξὸν αὐτῶι, ἔδω[κε
τ̣[ο]ῖc φίλοιc· ἀγανακτήcαντα [δὲ τὸν
Δία ἐπαρτῆcαι αὐτῷ τὴν κ[
τ̣ιμωρίαν, ἐκβαλόντα τω[
κ̣αὶ τὴν Cίπυλον ἐπικαταcτή[cαν-
τ̣α, ἔνθα ἐκηδεύετο. ἡ δ' ἱ[cτορία
π]α̣ρ̣ὰ̣ Ἀ̣cκληπιάδη̣ι. Ὀδ μ.
Ἀ]ργὼ παcιμέλουcα παρ' Α[ἰήταο.
Τ̣υρὼ ἡ Cαλμωνέωc ἔχ[ουcα δύο
παῖδ]αc ἐκ Ποcειδῶνο[c, Νηλέα τε
καὶ Πελία]ν, ἐπέγημε Κ[ρηθέα
. . . .

115 δ' ἱ[|| 116 ο\δ/ μ : Montanari (1995: 146) supplements: Ὀδ(υccείαc) μ || 117 παρ' || 119 ποcι-

Fr. 5 ↓ (12, 70)

. . . .
]ια̣δ[
πέμπ]ει παρὰ Χ[είρων]α[
τραφ]ε̣ὶc δὲ παρὰ τούτωι καὶ ἠ[ΐ-
θε]οc γενόμενοc ἦλθεν εἰc
Ἰω]λκὸν ἀπαιτῶν τὴν πα-
τρῶι]αν ἀρχὴν τὸν Πελίαν. ὁ [δ]έ[
ἔφαc]κεν αὐτὸν δεῖν πρότε-
ρον] κ̣ομίcαι τὸ χρυcοῦν δέ-
ροc ἐ]κ Κόλχων. ἀκούcαc δὲ τα[ῦ-
τα ὁ] Ἰάcων λέγει τῷ Χείρωνι[·
καὶ α]ὐτῷ ὁ Χείρων cυνεξέ[-
πεμ]ψεν τοὺc ἠϊθέουc. κατα[-
cκευάζ]ει δ' ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ τὴν Α[ρ-
γώ. πλέ]οντεc δὲ ἀφικ̣[νοῦν-
ται πρὸc τὰc Πλα]γκτὰ[c
. . . .

122 Χ[είρων]α ⟦παρ[.]⟧ || 126 πελ\ι/ανδ̣[|| 128 after ρον is no space for δια] as supplemented in ed. pr. || 130 χειρο- || 131 ὁ add. ed. pr. || 132 ηϊθε- || 133 δ' || 135]γ'κτα[

Fr. 6 → (12, 70)

. . . .

Φι]ν̣εύc. [τοῦτον δὲ τὸν
Φιν]έα ἰδόντε[c οἱ περὶ τὸν
Ἰάco]να παρεκάλο[υν ὑποθέc-
θαι π]ῶc διαπλεύcωcι τὰ[c Πλαγ-
κτ]ὰc πέτραc. ὁ δ' εἶπεν δ̣[ιηγήcα-
cθ]αι, ἐὰν ἀποcτήcωcι τὰ[c Ἁρ-
π]υίαc. θέντεc δὲ [c]υνθ[ήκαc
ἐπαγγέλλονται αὐτῶι το̣ῦ[-
τ]ο δρᾶν ἐφ' ὅcον δύνανται. [ὁ δὲ Φι-
νε]ὺc ἐν τῇ Ἀργοῖ κελεύε[ι φέ-
ρ]ειν πελειάδα καὶ α[

. . . .

137 ϊδ- || 140 δ' | δ̣[ιαπλεύcε- ed. pr. : δ̣[ιηγήcα- supplevi || 142]υΐαc || 143 α̣τεπετελλονται : ἐπαγγέλλονται sch. || 144 letter crossed out between first α and ν || 146 πελι-

Fr. 6 ↓ (12, 85)

. . . .

ἔνθα δ' ἐνὶ] Cκύλλη ναίε[ι·
Cκύλλ]α θυγάτηρ μὲν ἦ[ν
Φόρκ]υνος̣ καὶ Κραταιΐδ[οc,
φω]νὴν δὲ εἶχεν νεογν[οῦ τι-
νοc] Ἑ̣κά[τ]ηc cκυλακίου. ταύ[τηc
τὸ μέγεθοc ἦν θαυμαcτό[ν,
εἶχε δὲ πόδαc ιβ̅, κεφαλὰc δ[ὲ ϛ̅,
ἐν] ἑκάcτῳ δ' εἶχε cτόματι ὀ[δόν-
των] τριcτοιχείαν, ὀφθ[αλ-
μοὺc] πυρώ̣δ̣ε̣ι̣c, κ̣α̣ὶ̣ τ̣ὸ[

. . . .

149 -ταϊδ[|| 153 δ' (not δὲ ed. pr.) || 154 \δ'/

Fr. 7 → (13, 96)

. . . .

Φόρκυνοc δέ τ]ιc ἔc[τι λιμήν·
Φόρκυν δαίμω]ν̣ θαλά[ccιοc, τὸ
πρότερον δι]ατρίβω[ν πρὸc τῷ
Ἀρυμ]ν̣ίωι καλο̣[υμένῳ ὄρει·
οἰκῶν] δὲ τὴν Φόρ[κυνοc ἀπ'

αὐτοῦ] καλουμένην [βῆccαν, κα̣̃τα
φανὲν] αὐτῷ καταλιπ[εῖν τὰc
τρι?]βὰc ταύταc ἀφ[ίκετο εἰc
τὴν Κ]εφαλληνίαν [καὶ ἐκλε-
ξάμεν]οc τόπον αὐτ[ῷ ἐπιτή-
δειον] ἐνθάδε κατῴ[κηcεν
. . . . .]ιμονιοc ὁ τό[ποc
. . . . .]αι δὲ τῷ τῆc ['Ιθάκηc λιμέ-
νι . . .]αι ἀπ' αὐτ[οῦ
]. [
. . . .

160]ν̣ειωι || 163 -λειπ[|| 164 τρίβουc sch.

Fr. 7 ↓ (13, 259; 14, 327)

. . . .
τῆc 'Αθην]ᾶc̣ [ᾤκειλε μετὰ
τοῦ Κάλχ]α̣ν̣το[c καὶ Cθενέλου
εἰc Κολο]φῶνα [καὶ ἐνταῦθα
βίον κατ]έcτρεψε. [ἡ δὲ ἱcτορία
παρὰ Λ]υκόφρονι.
τὸν δ'] ἐ̣c̣ Δωδώνην [φάτο· βήμεναι
ποιμὴν ν]έ̣μων πρόβα[τα ἐν τοῖc
τῆc Δ]ω̣δώνηc ἕλε[cι τοῦ πέ-
λαc ὑφ]ε̣ίλατο νομὴ[ν καλλίcτην
καὶ εἴρξ]αc εἰc τὴν cφε̣[τέραν αὐ-
λὴν ἐφ]ύλαccεν. ὅθ[εν φαcὶ τὸν
δεcπό]την ζητεῖ[ν παρὰ τοῖc
ποιμέ]cι τὰ κεκρυμ[μένα πρό-
βατα, οὐ]χ εὑρόντα [δὲ τὸν θεὸν
ἐρωτᾶ]ν τίc ἐc[τιν ὁ κλέψαc
]. . [
. . . .

177-178 [φάτο· ποι- | μήν τιc ν]- ed. pr., which is less likely both in view of the length of the line, the method of lemmatizing in ll. 117, 147 and 157 and in view of the reading of the scholia ποιμὴν νέμων || 180 νομη[* ed. pr., where the commentary represents the reading of the scholia as follows: ὑφεί-λετο ποίμνην καλλίcτην. Cf. however the app. crit. on this sch. (Ddf. Od. II p. 592) "ποίμνην Barnes. pro νομήν."

I abstain from transcribing one unedited small fragment because my photographs are too vague to be used for this purpose.

57 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 29784 (*MPER* N.S. 1, 17) ?, III

ed. pr. H. Gerstinger, *Mittheilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien,* 1, Wien 1932, 130-131
cf. Pack 2447; R. Pfeiffer, *Philologus* 92, 1937, 16 n. 25

Contents: MH *Od.* 11, 318 and 576?; cf. comm.

Fr. 1, col. I + II

. . . . .	. . . .
]cυ	υ̣[
] . . ι	. . . . λ[
]τ̣˙	λ̣αcθα[
]ει	τουδα̣[
]εν	ογυπαc̣[

col. ii 5 γ corr. from π : δύ | ο γῦπαc[Pfeiffer

Fr. 2

. . . .
]ι ἀν[άβα-
cιν μελ̣[ε]τ̣[ῶντε]c˙ Ἄ[ρτε-
μ̣ιc δὲ τῶι πατρὶ cυ[μμα-
χοῦcα μετεμόρφωc̣[εν ἑ-
αυτὴν εἰc̣ δορκάδα κ[αὶ
κυνηγετο̣[ύ]ντων τῶν [
περὶ τὸν Ὦτον κα̣ὶ̣ Ἐ̣π[ι-
άλτην μέccη δ̣ι̣έδραμ[εν˙
οἱ δὲ βαλόντεc τοὺc ἄκο̣[ν-
τ]αc ἀλλήλουc ἀπέκτει̣ν̣α̣ν̣.

6 suppl. Pfeiffer : τῶι Δι]ὶ̣ ἀν[αίρε- | cιν ed. pr.

58 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4308 Oxyrhynchus, II?

ed. pr. M.A. Harder, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 62, London 1995, 51 + pl. VI
* inspexi

Contents: list of children of goddesses and mortal men

. . . .
'Αρμονία καὶ Κάδμος 'Ινὼ C]ε̣μ̣έλην 'Αγαυὴ̣ν̣
Αὐτονόην Πολύδωρο]ν̣
ἐγένοντο Καλλιρόης κ]αὶ Χρυcάορος Γηρυονε[ύc
'Ηοῦc καὶ Τιθωνοῦ Μέ]μ̣νων καὶ 'Ημαθίων
'Ηοῦc καὶ Κεφάλου Φαέθω]ν
Μηδείας καὶ 'Ιάcονος Μή]δειος
Ψαμάθηc καὶ Αἰακοῦ Φῶ]κος
Θέτιδος καὶ Πηλέως 'Αχι]λ̣λεύc
'Αφροδίτηc καὶ 'Αγχίcου Α]ἰ̣ν̣ε̣ί̣α̣c
Κίρκηc καὶ 'Οδυccέως ῎Αγριο]c̣ κ̣α̣ὶ Λατῖνος
Καλυψοῦc καὶ 'Οδυccέως] Ναυcίθοος καὶ Ναυc[ίνοος

4 χρυcαροc || 10 λατεινοc

59 *P.Haun.* 1, 7 Fayum?, I

ed. pr. T. Larsen, *Papyri Graecae Haunienses* 1, Kopenhagen 1942, 45-49 + pl. 3
cf. Pack 2454; R. Merkelbach, *APF* 16, 1958, 126

Contents: narrative on Philoctetes or Telephus; catalogue of ships

Col. I . . . .
]ν μηδε̣ὶ̣c̣ δ̣ε̣[
]ι̣ξειτ̣α̣ι̣ γὰρ εcα̣[
θ]ε̣ῶν βουλάc ̣ [̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]ν
]τ̣ο ἕλκος κα ̣ [̣()] τρο ̣
]αιοιc ἡγεμὼ̣ν ε-
]α̣ι̣ν̣ γὰρ ἀποτρε-
] ̣ οc κ̣α̣ὶ ει
]ουcτερον
]ην μη πρω-
]ειν πεπρω-
]αν πρῶτοc

4-5 κατ̣[ὰ] Τροί- | ηc ed. pr., but instead of τ perhaps ι; ο is followed by a high dot and a low horizontal || 7 οc κ̣α̣ι

Col. II . . . .
ἀκ̣ο̣ντα [ἐξ 'Αργίccηc Πο-
λυ̣ποίτηc̣. οἱ δ̣ὲ̣ [ἰατροὶ

ἐκ Τρίκκηc τοὶ ᾿Α̣[cκληπι-
άδαι τ̣[ε]c̣cαράκον̣τ̣α̣ [νῆ-
αc. ἐκ [Μηθ]ώνηc Φιλ[οκτή-
τηc ἑπτά. Πρωτ̣[εcίλαοc
ἐκ Φυλάκη[c τεccαράκοντα.
φηραθεο ̣ [
κ̣α̣. Βοιωτῶν [.]ε̣ ̣ [

13 [παῖδεc ed. pr. is unlikely : [ἰατροὶ Merkelbach (1958: 126) || 19 Φήραθε Ε̣ὔ̣[μηλοc ἔνδε- ed. pr., but the reading ε̣υ̣[is impossible : Th. Christensen and A. Bülow-Jacobsen who checked this reading in the original, suggest ο̣ν̣[. There is a small blank space between α and θ, cf. comm. || 20 κα β-

60 *P.Oxy.* 53, 3702 Oxyrhynchus, II-III

ed. pr. M.W. Haslam, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 53, London 1986, 31-40 + pl. V
cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 66, 1986, 17-18
* inspexi

Contents: list of Greek leaders against Troy; suitors of Penelope; story on Danaids; list of Argonauts

Fr. 1 col. I

᾿Αμφίμαχ]οc Κτ̣[ε]άτου,
᾿Αμ]αρυγκεὺc
Πολύξεινοc ᾿Αγ]αcθένουc,
ἐξ Ἤλι]δοc· Μέγηc
Φυλέωc ἐκ Δουλιχίου·] ᾿Ιδομε-
νεὺc Δευκαλίωνοc καὶ] Μηριόνηc
Μόλου ἐκ Κρήτηc· Με]νεcθεὺc
Πετεῶ ἐξ ᾿Αθηνῶ]ν̣· ᾿Ακάμαc
Θηcέωc] Τληπό-
λεμοc ῾Ηρακλέουc ἐκ ῾Ρό]δου· Νι-
ρεὺc Χαρόπου ἐκ Cύμ]ηc· Ἄντι-
φοc καὶ Φείδιππος Θεcc]αλοῦ ἐκ
]c ἐκ Φερῶ(ν)·
] ἐξ †᾿Αριcτε†
]ων
]Φιλοκτή-
τηc Ποίαντοc ἐκ Μελι]βοίαc·
]c ἐκ Γυρ-

τώνης˙ Λεοντεὺς Κο]ρώνου
Πρόθοος] Τενθρη-
δόνος ἐκ Μαγνησία]ς˙ Cχεδίος
καὶ Ἐπίcτροφος Ἰφίτ]ου ἐκ Φω-
κίδος˙ Πάτροκλος Μεν]οιτίου
]ς Θέcτορος
]υ ἐκ Θηβῶ(ν)˙
]μου ἐκ Βοι-

3 -υc˙ || 4 -οc˙ || 5 ειδ- || 8 perhaps]ν˙ || 10 perhaps]δου˙ | νει || 11 ηc˙ || 12 αλου˙ || 13 c˙εκφερω || 17 -αc˙ || 21]ς˙ || 24 -ροc˙ || 25 -βω

Col. II

ρκβ
ωτίας˙ Ἀcκάλαφος καὶ Ἰάλμ[ε-
νος Ἄρεως ἐκ †Μινύρου˙† Αἰγ[ια-
λεὺς Ἀδράcτου ἐξ Ἄργους. [
Πηνελόπης μνηςτῆρες [τῆς
Ἰκαρίου˙ ιβ καὶ Μέδων ὁ κῆ[ρυξ
κ[αὶ] Φήμιος ᾠδός˙ ἐκ δὲ Cά[μης
κ[δ˙] ἐκ Δουλιχίου νβ˙ . [
.] . . . Δαναοῦ θυγατ[έρες (?)
†κα . τ . ων† Αἰγύπτου παίδω[ν ἑ-
κάστῃ ἀπέκτεινεν˙ κ[αὶ] διὰ ν . [
αἰτίαν τοῦτο ἐπράχθη προεκ[-
θήcομαί cοι. Αἴγυπτος γὰρ ἀπὸ τ[ῆς
ὁμωνύμου χώρας βαcιλεὺς γεν[η-
θεὶς προςέταςςε Δαναῶι δ[οῦναι
πρὸς γάμον τοῖς α[ὐτοῦ παιςὶ τὰς
Δαναΐδας˙ μὴ βουλόμ[ενος δὲ τοῦτο
πρᾶξαι Δαναὸς ἔφυ[γε μετὰ τῶν
θ[υγ]ατέρων εἰς τὴν ν[
νη[. Π]ελοπόννηςον [
βαcιλείαν . . ει βραχὺ[ν
cας χρόνον κατε . [
παραγενηθέντ . . . [
καὶ βίᾳ ταῖς Δαν[α]ΐς[ι

27 -ας˙ prob. | ϊαλ- || 28 -ρου˙ || 29 -γουc˙ || 31 εἴκα-, ε added by *m*. 1 | -ου˙ ιβ || 32 -δοc˙εγ || 33 κ, top of upright visible | νβ˙ || 33-34 ἐ[κ Ζακύ(ν)θ]ου κ ed. pr. : this is the reading one expects, but both ε[(vertical and oblique trace) and]ουκ (bottom of two letters and high dot followed by

a curved trace which looks more like *β*, *θ*, or *ο* than like *κ*) are very uncertain || 35 †*κα . τ . ωνͅ*†, *α* is followed by a low dot (the reading c is possible) and the first *τ* by a long vertical stroke; Haslam's emendation ἕ- | *καcτον τῶν* (he prints †*κα . των*† in the text) is more probable than Luppe's suggestion (1986: 17-18) *ν̣ κ̣α̣ὶ τῶν Αἰγύπτου παίδω̣[ν ὃν ἑ-* || 36 *διὰ ν̣ .* [: perhaps *δι-ὰ{ν} τ̣[ίνα*, cf. comm. ed. pr. || 37 *επρακθη* || 39 *ομονυμου* || 41 *προc'γαμον τοιc*⟦*αι*⟧*α*[|| 42 -*ναϊ*- | "αc corr. from (or to?) εc" ed. pr.

Fr. 2

῎Αρ]γουc˙ Περι[κλύμενοc
] . δου ἐκ Πύ̣[λου˙
᾿Αγκ]α̣ῖ̣οc Ποcειδ[ῶνοc ἐκ Cάμου˙ Ζήτηc καὶ
Κάλ]α̣ΐc Βορέου ἐ̣[κ Θρᾳ̣κηc˙ Λυγκεὺc
καὶ] ῎Ιδαc ᾿Αφ[αρέωc ᾿Η-
ρακλ]ῆc Διὸc ἐξ [῎Αργουc˙ ᾿Εργῖνοc
Κλυ]μένο̣υ ἐξ ᾿Ο[ρχομενοῦ˙ ῎Αδμη-
το]c̣ Φ̣έρητοc̣ [ἐκ Θεccαλίαc˙ Εὔ-
ρυτ]ο̣c̣ καὶ ᾿Εχ[ίων ᾿Ερμοῦ
Να]ύπλιοc Π̣[οcειδῶνοc ἐξ ῎Αρ-
γου]c˙ ᾿Ιππάλκ̣[ιμοc Πέλοποc ἐκ Πί-
cηc˙] Κάcτωρ̣ [καὶ Πολυδεύκηc Διὸc
. . . .

Fr. 3

. .
] . [
]νοιδ[
]ρ̣ . μ̣[
. .

Fr. 2 50 -γουc˙ || 51] . upright | first *υ* corrected || 53 -α̣ϊc | -ου˙ || 54 ειδαc˙ || 55 -ηc˙ || 57]c̣˙ prob. || 59 -πλειοc || 60 -c˙

61 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4097 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. R.L. Fowler, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 61, London 1995, 46-54 + pl. VII
* inspexi

Contents: list of Argonauts; Calydonian boar-hunters; names of fathers

Fr. 1 (a) (b)

(a)

. . . . . .
]Θηc̣ε̣ύc [
]Θερcᾴνωρ [
]᾿Ιάcων [
]᾿Ιόλαοc . [
]῎Ιφικλοc . [

(b)

. . . . .
]ἐ̣ξ ῎Α[ρ]γ̣[ουc
]ἐκ Φυλάκ̣η[c

]᾿Ιλεύς ᾿Ο̣[δ]ο̣ιδό̣κ̣ο̣υ̣ ἐκ Λοκρῶ[ν
]῞Ιφιτος Ν[αυβόλ]ο̣υ̣ ἐκ Φωκέ[ων
]Κ̣άςτωρ καὶ Πολυδε[ύκης Δι]ὸ̣ς ἐκ Cπάρ[της
]Κ̣ηφεύς . [. . . .
] . ρίαςος καὶ Φῶκο[ς
Πη]λεὺς καὶ̣ ἐξ ᾿Α̣[
] . καὶ ῞Ιφιτ̣[ος
]υ̣ς καὶ ᾿Ινα̣[
] . ς [
. . . . . .

3 ϊα- || 4 ϊο- || 5 ειφι- || 7 and 12 ειφι- || 8 Δι]ὸ̣ς not in ed. pr., but a curved trace and ς are visible in fr. b || 12] . , vertical trace rather than ς, cf. Κλυτίο]ς̣ ed. pr.

Fr. 2 (a) (b)

. . . . .
] . κ̣α̣ι̣ο . [. . . . .
] . κ̣μω[ ] . . οθοα .() . [
] . υκολ[ ]κ̣ερκυωνοςηπε[
Δ]ευκαλ[ίων] Μινῶος [
Δ]όλοψ [ ] λυκαιφου [
Δ]ρ̣ύας κα . [ ]ς Λαπίθο̣[υ
] . κευ̣[ ] . . . θ . . [.] . [
. . . .

18 μει-

Fr. 3

. . . . .
] . . . . . [
]ε̣ος [
]ειδωνο . [
] . ελοποc̣ . [
]ερμ . [
] . ρηϊθο[
. . . . .

Fr. 4

. . . . .
top?
]τ̣ωντοτων̣[
] . ρωταςετεια̣[
] [
]παν . [
. . . .

Fr. 5

. . . . .
] . . ρι[
] . κα . [

Fr. 6

. . . . .
δε[
[

] . αστ . [
]λλ . [
]ηϊθ[
. . . .

. [.] . λε . . . [
. ασονος[
(). . λ̣α̣χ̣ο̣[
. . . .

Fr. 7 . . .
] . εξα[
. . .

62 *P.Duk.* inv. 752 (*P.Robinson* inv. 10) ?, II

described by W.H. Willis (1968: 74); cf. Henrichs (1987: 273)
* This papyrus kept in the Duke University Special Collections Library has not been published before but an image is accessible on the World Wide Web: http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/752.html. The following transcript is based on this image and on examination of a photograph. I am very glad that I have been able to use a private transcript made by W.H. Willis and shown to me by P. van Minnen together with the photograph.

Contents: list of Calydonian boar-hunters ?, famous heroes

Col. I: small unidentified remains

Col. II

καιος καὶ Ε̣[ὔ]ρ̣υμνος ʼΙπ̣π[ο-
κώοντος˙ [Κά]στωρ κα̣[ὶ] Π̣[ο-
λυδεύκης Τ̣υ̣νδάρεω[ς
Λαέρτης ʼΑ̣[ρ]κισίου˙ ʼΑμα-
ρυγκεὺ[ς] Ε̣ . . ω̣δου˙ Λυγ-
κεὺς κα̣[ὶ Ἴ]δ̣ας ʼΑφαρέ-
ως˙ ʼΗϊ[ο]ν̣ε̣ὺ̣ς Αἰνείας̣
Πελασγο̣ί̣˙ Λυγκήστης
καὶ Οἶνοψ˙ Ἀ̣καρνᾶνες˙
ʼΑγκαῖος Αἰτωλός˙ Αὐτο-
μήδης Θ̣εσσαλός˙ Ἴφ[ι-
κλος ʼΑρ̣γεῖος˙ Νέστω[ρ
παι . . . [. .]˙ Χ̣αλκώδων
Χορ[ ] . . θέως˙ ʼΑμ[υ-
θάων . . [ ] . μηστος Ἄλκ[αν-
δρος [.] . [.] . . ς̣ εὐψυχότα[τοι.

. . [.]ι ἀφ' Ἡρακ[λ
Ἡρακλῆς [Δι]ὸς· Θη[σεὺς
Αἰγέως· [Περ]σεὺς ὁ Δ[ιὸς
καὶ Δαν[άης· Μελ]έ[αγρος
Οἰνέως[
ως ς . [
ε . [
. [
. . . .

5 ρυνκ- | λυν || 6 απα- || 7 ηει[|| 8 λυνκη- || 10 ανκαι- || 13 perhaps παις ὤ[ν? Haslam (private note) || 14 Κρ]η{θε}-θέως Willis || 20 -ης] Με[λέαγρος Willis

63 *P.Stras.* W.G. 332 ?, II

ed. pr. J. Schwartz, *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni* 2, Milano 1957, 151-156
cf. Pack 2452; S. Daris, *Aegyptus* 39, 1959, 18-21
* my observations in app. crit. and the transcript of l. 26ff. (not in ed. pr.) are based on examination of a photograph

Contents: list of Muses? and offspring; victors in games held for Pelias

Col. I

ναυ . . . [.] . . [. .]ηρ
Κλειὼ Μοῦσα Πιέρωι
τῷ Μάγνητος ἐξ ὧν
Ὑμέναιος Οὐραν[ί]α
Μοῦσα[. .] . [Ἀμφι]μά-
ρ]ῳ τῷ Ποσειδῶνος
ἐ]ξ ἧς Λίνος γίνεται
Ἐ]ν τοῖς Πελίου ἄθλοις
ἐ]νίκησαν Ζή-
τη]ς Βορέου δόλιχον
Κά]σ[τωρ Τυνδάρε]ω
στ]άδιον [Κ]άλαι[ς Β]ο-
ρέο]υ δίαυλον [Π]ολυ-
δε]ύκη[ς] Τυνδ[άρε]ω
πυγ]μὴν Τ[ελαμὼν
. . . .

1 prob. Ναυϲίθ[ο]οϲ, cf. comm. || 2 πειερωι || 4 -οϲ ου- || 6 sic ed. pr., the traces after Π̣ο̣ϲ̣ε̣ι̣δ̣ are obscure || 7 γεινεται || 9 -αν ζη- || 12 -ον [|| 13 -ον [|| 15 -μην τ-

Col. II

καὶ ἀποκτείν[ει] Λ̣ύ-
κον τὸν Δ . . τ[ου Θρᾶ-]
ικα Βελλεροφ[ό]ν̣-
τηϲ Γλαύκου ἵπ[πῳ κ]έ̣-
λητι Ἰόλαοϲ [Ἴ]φ[. . . ()]ν̣
ἅρματι τ̣ε̣λ̣[ε]ί̣[ω]ι [Ἴφ]ι-
κλοϲ Φυλ[ά]κου̣ [ϲ]υν̣ω-
ρίδι πωλικῇ Εὔρυ-
τοϲ [Ἑ]ρμ[ο]ῦ τόξῳ Αἰ-
νε[ὺϲ] Ἑρμοῦ ϲφενδό-
νῃ . .]ε[ ] . [. . .] .
]ηρε
] . υψη
]αιοϲ
]λιϲ̣
] . α
]ον

16-17 suppl. Daris; feet of Λυ are visible (not in ed. pr.) || 18 ικα β- |]ν̣ (not in ed. pr.), part of upright || 19]ε̣ (not in ed. pr.), horizontal trace || 20 -τι ιο- | *pace* ed. pr. p. 155, there is enough space for the genitive of the name Iphicles = [Ἴ]φ[ικλέο]ν̣[ϲ], or Iphiclos = [Ἴ]φ[ίκλο]ν̣; the ν̣ is almost certain || 23 -κη [|| 26ff. ed. pr. does not give a transcript of the end of l. 26, 27ff. and of col. III apart from some words || 26] . [. . .] . , high horizontal to the left of upright, π or τ?; at line-end is a small curved trace, perhaps ε, ο or ϲ || 28] . , high dot || 30 instead of λ perhaps α; ϲ̣ or perhaps ε || 31] . , apex of α, δ or λ || 32 below this line are no more traces visible, which may point to a lower margin

Col. III

ριϲφιλ̣[
] . [ ] [] . [
Οἰάγρου[
. . [ ] . τ̣[
. . [ ] . . . [
. . α . ε[
.]η . ω[Ῥα-

δαμανθ[
Ευρωπη[
. . . . . . [
. . . . [
π . . [
cα . [
. . . [
. . . . [
] . . [
. . . . . .

34 surface is damaged, only a few dots are visible; the last trace resembles the top of e.g. ϵ, c || 36 small high horizontal followed by apex of α, δ or λ; τ is preceded by the upper parts of two verticals, prob. η || 37 . . [, some dots | . . . [, dot in mid-line and at bottom; bottom of α or λ; dot in mid-line || 38 α is preceded by low dot and foot of γ, ι or τ, and followed by low vertical trace, prob. the foot of ρ, some space without traces of ink and ϵ || 39 A- | γ]ηνω[ρ ed. pr. fits the traces || 39-40 ʽPα- | δαμανθ[already suggested by Haslam (1986: n. 1) : ed. pr. has]δα μανθ[|| 41 Ευρωπη[already in ed. pr. || 42 high dot above small ascending oblique plus high stroke: prob. κ (or χ?). Second letter resembles left part of λ; hereafter several high dots of ca. 4 or 5 letters || 43 horizontal, perhaps η, followed by several vertical traces || 44 . . [, top of ρ, or less likely ϵ; and a low dot || 45 . [, lower part of two verticals, prob. ν but η or π also possible || 46 oblique strokes of about three letters; the second prob. α or λ || 47 mostly vague traces; the first letter may be π of which the corner at the right-hand top is visible || 48 perhaps top of ϵ followed by upright

64 *P.Mil.Vogl.* 3, 126 Tebtunis, II-III

ed. pr. I. Cazzaniga, *Papiri della Università degli Studi di Milano* 3, Milano/Varese 1965, 55ff. + pl. I
identified by P.J. Parsons, *Gnomon* 38, 1966, 673-674
re-edited by L. Salvadori, *RFIC* 113, 1985, 174-181 incl. pl.
* text printed according to sec. ed.

Contents: list of unions of Zeus with mortal women and offspring

. . . .
] . . . [
ρα[.] . . [. .]ουδϵμϵια . [
προ[. . .] . ϵα αὐτῶ[

γεννηθεὶc εcτ . [
_τροc Θεμιcτοῖ τῇ . [ἐξ ἧc
_Λαπίθηc [Ἱ]πποδα[μείᾳ τῇ Δανα-
_οῦ ἐξ ἧc Ὤλενοc κ(αὶ) [Ἰcονόῃ τῇ Δανα-
οῦ ἐξ ἧc Ὀρχομ(εν)ὸc κ(αὶ) Χρ[ύcηc κ(αὶ) Ἰοῖ
_τῇ Ἰνάχου ἐξ ἧc ⟦. . . . [.]⟧ Ἔ]παφο[c κ(αὶ)
Ἰμάνδῃ Γηγενί[ου] ἐν Ῥόδῳ γενόμ[ε-
νοc ὄμβ]ροc ἐξ ἧc Cπαρταῖοc κ(αὶ) Κ[ρό-
νιοc κ(αὶ) Κύ]τοc κ(αὶ) Μοψ[οπίᾳ
. . . .

7, 8, 11, 12 -⋆- || 8 Salvadori adds a paragraphus beneath οὗ | μ̣ || 11 εξ\η/c

65 *P.Med. inv.* 123 ?, II-III

ed. pr. S. Daris, in Samuel D.H., *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of Papyrology*, Toronto 1970, 97-102
cf. A. Grilli, *PP* 26, 1971, 354-367
* my remarks are based on examination of a photograph

Contents: list of Actaeon's dogs; monsters

. . . .
] . C[ύροc] Λάμ-
ποc]καc Μάγγοc Χάροψ
Α]ἴθων Ἀτρεὺc Αἰνεὺc>
Β]ορέαc Δράκων Δίων>
Μύροc Αἵμων Ἰχνεύμων
Ὠκύδρομοc γίνονται κ̅θ̅
θήλειαι αἵδε
Ἅ]ρπυια Κελαινὼ Ἄρπε[]
]τεθ[. .]μη Γοργὴ Λυγρὴ Ἀργή
]λα[. .] . Αἴθουcα Μαρμα-
] . . . . [Θ]ηροφόνη
] . . ρια Λέαινα Ὀξυβόη Λυ[
Ὠ]κυθόη Δειν[ο]μάχη γί(νονται) ι̅η̅[
Τ]άδε παρὰ φύcιν
τέ]ρατα μυθολογεῖται
Ὕδρα] ἡ Λερναία ἐν Ἄργε[ι
πεν]τήκοντα κεφαλὰc[
ἔχου]cα
Χίμαι]ρα ἐν Λυκίαι πῦρ . . [

1-2 C[ύροc] Λάμπος suppl. Grilli (1971: 358) || 2 Δορ]κ̣ὰc ?, cf. comm. ed. pr. || 8 Ἄ]ρ̣πυια ed. pr. :] . πυ . α, traces of] . resemble α or δ | Ἄρπη ed. pr. || 9 θ̣[ed. pr. : ρ̣[seems also possible || 11 perhaps -α̣ν̣ . . θ̣η- || 12] . . ρεα ed. pr. wrongly, cf. Grilli (1971: n. 9) | Αυ[γκαίςτη or Αυ[κίςκη?, cf. comm. ed. pr. || 19 [Ἡ χ]ώρα ed. pr. :]ι̣, the photograph displays only the top of an upright, which resembles the second iota in l. 5. On Chimaera, cf. comm. | . . [ed. pr. but traces are not described; I discern one dot. One expects (ἀπο)πνέουςα or something similar.

66 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4099 Oxyrhynchus, I AD

ed. pr. R.L. Fowler, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 61, London 1995, 55-58 + pl. VIII
re-ed. by M. Huys, *ZPE* 113, 1996, 205-212
* inspexi

Contents: list of Epigoni; Moirai; Horai; Charites; Nymphs; Sirens; Gorgons; Titanides; Eumenides; Harpies; Hesperides; sentences of the Seven Wise Men

Col. I (a) (b)

. . .]ο̣ι̣ τῶν ἐπ̣[τά . . . . . Αἰγια]λ̣εὺc Ἀδράc̣του̣[
Θέρ]cανδρος Πο[λυνείκους Ἀ]λκμέων Ἀμφια-
ράου] Cθένελος Κα̣[πανέως Θ]ηξιμέλης Παρ-
θενο]π̣α̣ίο̣υ̣ Δ̣[ιομήδης Τυδέ]ως Μοῖραι
Κλω]θὼ Λάχεcι[c Ἄτροπος Ὧ]ραι Εὐνομίη Δίκη[
Εἰρή]νη Χάριτες Ε[ὐφροσύνη Θαλίη] Αἴγλη Νύμ̣φ[αι
. . . .]ηπανα̣γο . [Cειρῆνες Θ]ε̣λ̣ξιέπεια
] . νιc ευφρα . [Γοργόνες] Cθεν̣νὼ Μέ-
δουc]α Εὐρυάλη Τ̣[ιτανίδες Τ]ηθὺc Θέμιc Μνη[-
μοσύνη] Φ̣[ο]ί̣β̣[η Θεία Ῥεία] Εὐμενίδες Ἀλλη[-
κτὼ Μέγαιρα Τεισιφόνη] Ἅρπυϊαι Ἀελλὼ Ὠκυ-
πέτη Ἑc]περίδες Αἴγλη Ἐρύθεια̣[
]α̣ [ἐ]ν Δελφοῖc ἀν . . [
] . . .
]α̣ν̣ τίμα
φίλοι]c̣ βοήθει
]ε̣[ι]α̣c̣ ἔχου
] . . . ζῆλου
μ]ηδένα
] . ια

γ]ίνου   col. II
φίλοις ε]ὐ̣νόει
]ἄρ̣μοτε   .[
]ἄρεσκε   .[
]φεῦγε   .[
εὔχου] δ̣υνατά   .[
κ]α̣ίρια   δ̣[
τ]ίμα   η[
]. . . .   δ[
]   .[
].   .[
]   [
]   .[
]   c . [
]   .[
]   ε̣ . [
]   τ̣ . φ . [
]   [ ]τ̣ . . [
]   [ ] . . [
]   [ ] . [
]   [

. . . .

1 ἐπίγο]ν̣ο̣ι̣ τῶν ἐπ̣[τά Αἰγια]- ed. pr., but ν is not visible; the first traces consist of the lower part of a round letter and the foot of an upright. Huys suggests the suppl. υἱοί after ἐπ[τά || 6 Θαλίη om. Huys erroneously | -γλη̣ι || 7]ηπαναγο . [Huys (rightly), . [is ε or θ : Ἔρc]η Πάνδροc[οc ed. pr. || 11 αρπυϊ- || 13ff. text based on re-ed. Huys || 13 . . [, α, δ, or λ followed by γ, π, ρ (most prob.), or τ || 14 right part of round letter, c (rather than κ), round letter || 15 τοιμα || 18 coφ]ία̣ν̣ ζῆλου Huys, but the traces of the first three letters do not resemble ιαν: cf. app. crit. ed. pr. || 19 of η only low dot left || 20] . , α or δ, cf. Huys δίκ]α̣ια and in his comm. ἴ]δια || 21]ειvου || 26 low dot visible of δ || 28]ο̣ιμα || 29 last letter prob. c
col. ii 33 . [, prob. χ || 37 . [, υ fits traces || 38 τ̣ followed by upright

67 *P.Yale* 2, 108 ?, II-III

ed. pr. S.A. Stephens, *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library* 2, Chico 1985 (*Am.Stud.Pap.* 24), 98-100

Contents: list of institutions of games

ἕκ]τος [ἀγὼν ἐτέ]θη [ἐν Ἰcθμῷ
ἐπὶ Μελ[ι]κέρτηι τῶι Ἀθάμα[ντος
κ[α]ὶ Ἰνοῦc τῆc Κάδμου· κατ' ἄ[λλους
λ̣έγεται τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτο[ν θεῖναι
Θ]ηcέα Ϲ̣ίνιν ἀπ[ο]κ̣τ̣είνα[ντα τὸν
Πο]λυπήμονος
ἕβδομος ἀγὼν ἐτέθη ἐν [Ὀλυμπίᾳ,
ὃν ἔθηκεν Ἡρακλῆ[c] ἐπὶ Πέλ[οπι τῷ
Ταντάλου
ὄ]γδοος ἀγὼν [ἐτ]έθη ἐν Νεμέ[αι ἐπ'
Ἀρχεμόρῳ τῷ Ὑψιπύλης, ὃν ἔ[θηκαν
οἱ ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας
ἔνατος ἀγὼν ἐτέθη ἐν Τροί[ᾳ, ὃν
ἔθ[η]κεν Ἀχίλλευς ἐπ[ὶ] Πατρό[κλῳ
τ[ῷ] Με[ν]ο[ιτίο]υ
δέκ]ατος [ἀγὼ]ν̣ ἐ̣τ̣[έθη ἐν] Δ̣ε̣[λφοῖς

. . . .

3 *ειvουc* || 6 *πο]λυμ*, *π* added above *μ* as a correction. An expunging dot is written between verticals of *μ* || 10 Space for 1-2 letters between *θη* and *εν* || 11 *αρχεμορου του*

68 *P.Oxy.* 10, 1241 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. B.P. Grenfell-A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 10, London 1914, 99-112 cf. Pack 2069

Contents: list of sculptors; painters; grammarians; librarians; inventions concerning warfare and weapons

Col. I

ἀγαλ]ματοπο-
οί . . . . . . Φειδί]ας Ἀθηναῖ-
ος ἀνδριαντοπ]οιοὶ δὲ
Πολύκλειτος Πυθ]αγόρας Cκό-
πας ζωγράφοι Πολύγ]ν̣ωτος
8 lines lost?
]ν̣[ο]ς̣ γραμ-
ματικο . . . .]φιλος Ι-
γρα]μματι-
κοί Φιλα]δ̣ε̣λφου

. . . .

7 *ϊ-*

Col. II

ν[ι]οc Cιλλέωc ᾿Αλεξανδρεύc,
ὁ [κ]αλούμενοc ῾Ρόδιοc, Καλ-
λ̣[ι]μάχου γνώριμοc˙ οὗτοc
ἐγ̣ένε̣το̣ καὶ δ̣ιδ̣άc̣κ̣α̣λοc το̣ῦ̣
π̣ρ̣ώτου βαcιλέωc˙ τοῦτον
δ[ι]εδέξατο ᾿Ερατοcθένηc,
μεθ' ὃν ᾿Αριcτοφάνηc ᾿Απελ-
λοῦ Βυζάντιοc καὶ ᾿Αρίcταρ-
χοc˙ εἶτ' ᾿Απολλώνιοc ᾿Αλεξαν-
δρεὺc ὁ εἰδοφράφοc καλούμε-
νοc˙ μεθ' ὃν ᾿Αρίcταρχοc ᾿Αρι-
cτάρχου ᾿Αλεξανδρεὺc ἄνω-
θ̣εν δὲ Cαμόθρα̣ξ˙ οὗτοc καὶ
διδ[ά]cκαλοc [ἐ]γέ̣ν̣ε̣[το] τῶν
τ̣ο̣ῦ Φιλοπάτοροc τέκνων˙
μεθ' ὃν Κύδαc ἐκ τῶν λογχο-
φ[ό]ρων˙ ἐπὶ δὲ τῶι ἐνάτῳ
βα]cιλεῖ ἤκμαcαν ᾿Αμ̣μ̣ώ-
νι]ο̣c̣ καὶ Ζηνό[δοτοc] καὶ Διο-
κλ]ῆc καὶ ᾿Απολλό[δ]ωροc γραμ-
μα]τικοί[˙] cτρατόπ[ε]δον πρῶ-
το]ν cυcτήcαcθα[ι λ]έγεται ᾿Α-
cία]c ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν [᾿Α]cίαν φα-
cὶν] προcαγορεύεcθαι˙ cτρα-
τὸ]ν δ' ἐξάγαγεν ᾿Απιc ὁ Φο-
ρω]νέωc ξύλοι̣c̣ καὶ δέρμα-
cι ὅ]πλιcαc τοὺc μεθ' αὐτοῦ˙
πό]λεμον δ' ἐμφύλιον πρῶ-
τον] ἐ̣[ξε]νεγκεῖν λέγουcιν
᾿Αγή]ν[ο]ρα ποιμένα cυναγα-
γό]ν̣τα καὶ Πελα[c]γῶι ἐπι-
θέμ]ε̣νον ἐκδιῶξαι το̣ῦ̣τ̣ο̣ν̣˙
πόλι]ν δὲ πορθῆ[c]αι ᾿Ε̣[λ]ληνί-
δα] π̣ρ̣ῶ̣τ̣ον ᾿Αμφ[ιτρύω]να
cὺν] Κεφάλωι τῶ[ι ᾿Αθην]α̣ί̣-

. . . .

12 -μοc˙ || 14 -ωc˙ || 18 χοc˙ || 19 ϊδο- || 20 νοc˙ || 22 -θραξ˙ || 24 -νων˙ || 26 -ρων˙ || 33 -θαι˙ || 36 -του˙ || 37 ενφυ- || 41 -τον˙

Col. III

ους εἶναι Ταφίους [τῆς Κεφαλ-
ληνίας χώρας· Ἀρι̣[στοτέλης
δὲ περὶ Πελλήνη[ν φησὶ πρώ-
την τοῦτο συμβεβ[ηκέναι
τινὲς δὲ οὐ μόνον [ἐξανδρα-
ποδισθῆναί φασιν τ̣[ὴν Πελλή-
νην ὑπὸ Κλεισθέν̣[ους ὅτ' ἐ-
στρατεύσεν μετὰ Σι̣κ̣[υωνί-
ων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς γυναῖ[κας αὐ-
τῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρα[ς αἰχμα-
λωτισθείσας κατα[πορνευθῆ-
ναι· νεκροὺς δ' ὑπο̣[σπόνδους ἀ-
π̣ο̣δ̣ο̣ῦ̣ν̣αι λέ[γουσιν πρῶτον
Ἡρ[ακλέα . .] . [
τ̣ . . [τῶν ἐ-
ναντ̣[ί]ων φασὶ̣ . [
ἐ]ξαι̣τήσασθαι π[
. . . .] κ̣α̣[τ]α̣ . [
π̣ . . [.]ντα . . . [
. .]ω̣τ̣ημα[.]ηλω̣ . [
. .]μ̣ολις̣ . . ξαι̣ υ̣π̣[
. . .]μ̣ης̣ . . ς̣ . α̣ . ε̣σθα[ι
κ]ατὰ πόλεμον . ε̣ι̣ν̣ . . . . [
ἀν]ελέσθαι πρῶτον Θ̣ησέα[
πρὸς Θηβαίους, ὅτε τῶν Ἑ-
πτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας στρατευσάν-
των καὶ ἀτάφων ὄντων τὰ
σώμ̣ατα λαβὼν ἔθαψεν· φό-
νον ἐμφύλιον πρῶτος πε-
ποιηκέναι λέγεται Αἰτωλὸς
Ἆπιν τὸν Ἰοῦς ἀποκτε[ί]νας
ἀγωνιζόμενος πρὸς α̣ὐ̣τ̣ὸ̣ν̣
ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀζᾶνος ἄθλων ἃ
Κ]ηφε̣ὺς ἔθηκεν· τινὲς δὲ
Ἰ̣ξ̣ίονά φ[ασ]ι̣ν̣ ἀρχηγὸν ἐμ-
φυλίου φόν̣[ο]υ γενέσθαι ἀ-

46 -ρας· || 51 ὕπο || 56 ναι· || 72 -ψεν· || 75 ϊους || 78 -κεν·

Col. IV

ποκτεί]ναντα Ἡιονέα τὸν
πενθερόν]
ἐδίκασε] δὲ τ̣ο̣ὺς ἐμφυλίους
ἐν δικασ]τήριον ποιήσας
Φορωνεὺ]ς ὁ Ἰνάχου· ἀδελ-
φῶν δὲ π]ρ̣ῶτον λέγουσιν γε-
νέσθαι φ]ό̣νους ἐν Θήβαις Ἰ-
σμηνο]ῦ̣ καὶ Κλααίτου τῶν Ὠ-
κεανο]ῦ̣ περὶ Μελίας τῆς ἀ-
δελφ]ῆς· ὅπλα δὲ πολεμικὰ
κατ]ασκευάσασθαι λέγουσιν
οἱ] μ̣ὲν Ἄρη· τινὲς δὲ Κύκλω-
πα]ς ἐν τῶι ἐν Εὐβοίαι σπη-
λαί]ωι ὃ καλεῖται Τεύχιον·
ὁπ]λ̣ίσαι δὲ πρῶτον τεύχε-
σιν] Βριάρεων τῶν πρότε-
ρον] ἀνθρώπων δοραῖς τὸ σῶ-
μ]α σκεπαζόντων· ὡς δέ τι-
ν]ες ἱστοροῦσιν Ἄρη· ἄλλοι δέ
φασ]ι̣ν ὅπλα πρῶτον ἀρήϊα
Ἐνυά]λιον τὸν Διὸς ἐν Θράι-
κῃ π]οιῆσαι ὸ̣ν̣ ὑ̣[πὸ] Ἀ̣λ̣ωέ-
ως κα]ὶ̣ τῶν παίδω[ν δε]θῆ-
ναι Ἀ]πόλλωνα δὲ ἀ̣π̣[οκ]τ̣εί-
να]ν̣τ̣α τούτους ῥύσασθαι αὐ-
τ̣όν· ἕτεροι δὲ πρώτους μὲν
χαλκᾶ ὅ̣π̣λ̣α̣ ἐνδῦναί φασιν
ποιήσαντας Κούρητας ἐ̣ν̣
Εὐβοίαι καθ̣ο̣π̣λ̣ί̣σ̣α̣ν̣τ̣α̣ς̣
τοὺς μεθ' αὐ̣τ̣[ῶ]ν̣ . . τ̣ . . . .
Κύμινδιν τη̣ν̣ . . . . . . [.]ν
β̣ασίλισσαν κ̣ . . . . . ν̣ο[
ἄλλοι δ' Αἰγυπτί[ους λέγουσιν
ὅπλα τ' ἐπ' ἀν̣θ̣ρ̣ώ̣π̣[ους ποιή-
σασθαι καὶ δοραῖς σ̣κ̣[επασθῆναι
ἔτι δ' ἱμάτια ὑφ[ῆ]ν̣[αι καὶ ἱστι-

85 ἴναχου· || 87 ϊ- || 90 -ρη· || 94 τε⟦κ⟧\υ/χιον· || 98 -των· || 99 ϊστ- | -ρη· || 100 -ϊα || 106 τον·

Col. V

α καὶ ποδεῶνα[ϲ καταϲκευα-
ϲ̣αμένουϲ πλεῦϲ[αι˙ ϲιδηρ]ᾶ̣ δὲ
ὅπλα πρῶτοϲ Ἑλλ[ά]ν[ι]κοϲ κα-
: ταϲκευάϲαϲθαί φηϲιν Cάνε̣υ-
> νον Cκυθῶν ὄντα βα[ϲ]ιλέ-
α˙ Φ[ι]λόχοροϲ δὲ καθόπλι-
ϲιν γενέϲθαι πρῶτον λέγει
ἐπὶ Κέκροποϲ δόρυ καὶ δέρ-
ματοϲ ἀγρίου περιβολὴν˙ ὕ-
ϲτερον δ' ὅτ' ἤδη βόεϲ ἐθύ-
οντο, βοέαϲ τοὺϲ ἐν τῆι Ἀτ-
τικῆι ποιήϲαϲθαι˙ ἀϲπί->
δα δὲ πρῶτοϲ λέγεται Δανα-
ὸϲ εἰϲ Ἄργοϲ κομίϲαι˙ ὡϲ δὲ
τινεϲ ἱϲτοροῦϲιν πρῶτοϲ
κατεϲκευάϲατο Ἀκρίϲιοϲ
ἐν Ἄργει πολεμήϲαϲ πρὸϲ
Προῖτον τὸν ἀδελφόν˙ ἄλλοι
δέ φαϲιν οὐ τὸν Ἀκρίϲιον ἀλ-
λὰ Προῖτον ἀϲπίδαϲ ἐν Ἄρ-
γει καταϲκευάϲαϲθαι καὶ ταύ-
ταϲ ξυλίναϲ˙ οἱ δὲ χαλκῆν ἀ-
ϲπίδα πρῶτον ποιήϲαϲθαι
> Πύρριν Θερμαίου Κρῆτα οἰ-
κοῦντα ἐν Ὀφιούϲϲηι νήϲωι˙
τοῦτον δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐνοπλί-
ον ὄρχηϲιν το̣[ὺ]ϲ Ἐ̣τ̣ε̣όκρηταϲ
διδάξαι [τα]ῖϲ̣ ἀϲπίϲιν ὄχα-
να καὶ ἐ̣[τερ'] ὅ̣πλα Κᾶραϲ λέ-
γεται καταδεῖξαι˙ ὡϲ δέ τι- >
νεϲ ἱϲτοροῦϲιν πρότερον τὰϲ
ἀϲπίδαϲ π̣ε̣[ρ]ι̣ τοὺϲ ὤμουϲ πε-
ρ[ι]βαλλομένων Ἀ̣ργεῖοι πρῶ-
τοι πόρπακα[ϲ] καὶ ὀχεῖϲ περι-
θέντεϲ εἰϲ τ̣[ὴν ἀριϲτ]ε̣ρ̣ὰν πε-
ριέθεντο˙ του̣[. . . . . .]π̣ο . [

122 α˙ || 125 -λην˙ϋ || 130 -ϲαι˙ || 131 ϊϲτ- || 134 -φον˙ || 138 -ναϲ˙ ||
141 -ϲωι˙ || 147 ϊϲτ- || 152 -το˙

Col. VI

. .]ν ὅτ' ἐπ̣[ἐστρα-?
τ]ενον το[
_]ησαμε[ν πάρ-
μ]ην ὑπ' Ἰλλ̣[υριῶν
.]ησθαι· θυρ̣[εόν
των δημα . [Σα-
μοθράικης σ[άλπιγγας δὲ
πρώτους φησὶ̣[ν κατασκευά-
σασθαι Τυρρην[ούς
Τυρρηνοῦ '[
Αρδηλου[Αρ-
δηλον̣[
Ἀρέως[
προβολ̣[δι-
δασκαλο[
νων· ἑτε̣[ροι
σι δὴ ὅπλ[α
τὴν δὲ καλ̣[ουμένην πέλτην
ὑπὸ Θραικῶ[ν εὑρῆσθαι ξίφος
δὲ πρῶτον κα̣[τασκευάσασθαί
φασιν Λυκάονα [τὸν Πελα-
σγοῦ· τὸ δὲ ξιφοδ[ρέπανον ὃ
δή τινες καλο[ῦσιν ἅρπην
Περσέα [τ]ὸν Διός· ἑ̣[τεροι
\> δὲ Πηλέα τὸν Αἰ̣[ακοῦ
μάχαιραν δὲ ἐπ' α̣μ̣ε̣ι̣ν̣[
α[.] . . . [
5 lines lost
χ̣[
φα̣[
. . . .

156 ὑπ || 157 -θαι· || 162 -ου⊢ || 168 νων· || 171 ὑπο || 174 -ου·

69 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4306 Oxyrhynchus, I-II

ed. pr. M.A. Harder, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 62, London 1995, 22-49 + pll. III, IV, V
* inspexi

Contents: list of first sacrifices (1-19); builders of temples (19-32); epithets of goddesses (33-47); metamorphoses (47-58); sons of gods and mortal women (59-64); inventors (64-69); institutions of games (70-131); murderers tried in the Areopagus (132-152)

fr. 1 col. I

. . . . . .
] . [
] . [.] . .
]δεεν
] . ωι
]ουẹν
] . Κέκροψ ọ̔ δι-
φυ]ὴς̣ κλ[. . .]c ἐν Ἀθήναιc
. .] . ει Ἀρκ̣[ὰ]c̣ Διὸc καὶ Κ̣α̣λ̣-
λιc]τ̣οῦc ἐ̣[ν] Ἀρκαδίαι· Ἄρει Ἐν-
υ̣αλίωι Cκ̣ύ̣θαι πρῶτον ἔ-
θυc[α]ν̣· [Ἀ]φροδίτηι Φ̣ο̣[ίνι]κ̣ε̣[c
ἐν Κυθήρο̣ιc· Ἀρτέμιδι ἡ Ἐ-
φεc̣ίων πόλιc· Ἡφαίcτωι
Λῆ]μ̣ν̣[ο]c· Χ̣άριcιν Ἐτ[ε]ο̣κ̣λῆc
Κηφ]ιcοῦ ἐ̣ν̣ αρ . . . ορω̣· Δι-
ονύcω̣ι̣ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ Κάδμοc
ἐ]ν̣ Θ̣ήβαιc· ἔνιοι δὲ̣ φαcιν>
. . . . . . Ἡ]ρ̣ακ̣λε̣[ῖ] θῦcαι δ̣ . []
]._ο[. . . . .] . οἵδε>
πρῶ[τοι βωμοὺc θ]εῶν ἵ̣δρ̣υ̣-
cαν· [βωμὸν] Διὸc Ὀλύμπ̣[ι]ον
π̣ρῶτο̣[ν ᾠκ]οδόμ̣ηcεν Πε̣-
λ]α̣cγὸc ἐ[ν Ἀρ]καδίαι τὸν Δι-
ὸ]c τοῦ Λυκαίου ὀνομαζ[ό-
μ]ενον, δεύτερον Δευκα-
λί]ων Θετταλὸc ἐν Δίωι
τ]ῆc Μακε[δο]νίαc, τρίτοc
Π]ε̣λίαc ἐν Δ̣[ω]δ̣ώ̣ν̣αι τῆ[c] τ̣ῶν

Π]ελαςγῶν χω̣̂ρας· Ἥρας Φο-
ρω]νε[ὺ]ς ἐν Προςύμνηι τῆς
᾿Αρ]γείας, ἐν Cά[μ]ωι Ἥρ̣α̣[ς] . α̣
. . .]ςα Φορων . [. .] . [. . . . .] .

7 -ναι\c/ || 8 ·ι above ρ || 14 επ . \·τ[.]ο/κλης || 15]ειςου || 22 -μηςα\·ε/ν || 23 -γος corrected from -γοι || 26 δειω\-α/ι || 28 Π]ε̣λίας Bremmer ap. ed. pr. (there may be a connection with the old women in Dodona who are called 'peliai', cf. Strabo 7 frr. 1 and 2) | τ̣ω\ν/

fr. 1 col. II

. . . . . .
. . [
(2 lines lost)
. . . .] . . . [
. [. . . . .]εμ[. . .] ε̣[ν
Ἴ̣χ̣[μ]α̣ις τῆς Π̣α̣ι̣[ο]ν̣ί̣α̣[ς
λευκὸς Παίων, ὅθεν ᾿Η̣[ςίο-
δ̣ο̣ς̣ ᾿Ιχμαίην τὴν θεὸν π̣[ροσ-
αγορεύει ἐν τούτοις "᾿Ιχμα[ίης
Θέτιδος καὶ ἀγάςτονος ᾿Α̣μ̣[-
φ[ι]τ̣[ρ]ι̣τ̣η[.]"· ᾿Α̣θηνα[. .] ᾿Ερεχθεὺ̣[ς
. .]ου γλαυκωπ[
. [. . . ὅ]θεν γλαυκῶπιν τὴ[ν
θεὸν Ὅμ]ηρ̣ο̣[ς] λ̣ . [.]ει ἐν τ̣ο̣[ύ-
το]ι̣ς̣ "δεινὸν ὑπὸ κλαγγῆ[ς
γ[λαυ]κώπιδος ὀβρ̣[ι]μ̣ο̣π[ά-
τ̣ρ̣[η]ς"· οἵδε λ̣έγονται μετ[άλ-
λαξαι τὴν θνητὴν φύ̣[ςιν·
Καλλ[ι]ς̣τοῦν τὴ̣ν Λ̣υ̣κ̣ά̣ο̣ν̣[ος
ἄρκ[τον μ]υ̣θεῖται γ[εν]έ̣ςθαι[
. . [. . .]ο . [. τ]ῶι οὐρανῶι ε[
. τ̣[. . .] . τ . ν̣· ᾿Ιοῦν δὲ τὴν ᾿Ι-
νάχ̣[ο]υ̣ β̣οῦν γενέςθαι, ὅθεν
Βοὸς̣ Π̣ό̣ρ̣ος ἐκλήθη· [Π]ρόκν[η]ν
καὶ Φιλομήλαν τὰς Π̣ανδί̣-
ονος μυθεῖται γενέςθαι Πρ̣ό-
κ̣ν̣ην μ[ὲ]ν̣ ἀηδό̣να, [Φιλο-
μήλαν δὲ χελιδόνα[

35 μ\·τ/ || 48 coronis in margin || 49 μ\·λ/υκ- || 52 dot above δ || 54 -κν[η]\ν/ || 58 χελειδονα || beneath this column are faint traces of which the lower part looks like a coronis: maybe a scribe's exercise?

fr. 2 col. I

. . . . .

]ην . . [
]ων ≻[
]δνα
]θεν .
]
]
]
]ηικο .

col. II

. . . . . .

]ωνιδοc[
] . Ἕρμου [ἐκ Πηνελό-
πηc τῆc Ἰκα[ρίου
. . . ε . . c· Τροφών[ιοc Ἀπόλ-
λωνοc ἐξ Ἰοκάcτηc . [
γινουc· οἵδε πρῶτοι[
. .] . κατέδειξαν Ἀρ[κάδεc
ἔθυον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον[
δεύτερον [δ]ὲ βοάγρια[
. .] . . δρυο[. . . .]να . [
. . . . .]ρ . [. . . . . . .] . [

. . . .

col. ii 62 ε . . c : εουc ed. pr. || 64 part of coronis visible

fr. 3 (a + b + c)

. . . .

]τ[
] . . . [
. [. .]παληc . [
κο[. .] . ν . [.]κ . [δεύ-
τεροc ἀγὼν[
. . [.]μεν[. . .] . . [ὃν ἔ-
θηκεν Ἐριχθ[όνιοc
Ἡφαίcτου κ . [
ἐν τῶι ἀγῶν[ι
τρίτοc ἀγὼν . [ ] ὃν ἔθη[-
κεν Δαναὸc[ἐν] Ἄργε[ι
διὰ] τῶν γάμων τῶν θυγατ[έ-
ρω]ν αὐτο[ῦ . . .] . . υ· τέταρτ[οc
ἀγ]ὼν . . [. . . ἐν Τρα]πεζοῦ[ν-
τι τ]ῆc Ἀρκα[δίαc . .] . λειτ . [
Λύκ]αια· π[έμπτοc ἀγ]ὼν ε . [
] . . νι[. .] . . [. . . .]εναι ὃν[
ἔθη]κεν Ἄκα[cτοc] ὁ Π[ελίου
τοῦ Τ]υροῦc τῆc Cαλμω[ν]έω[c
καὶ Πο]cειδῶνο[c
] . ο . . [.] . . θ . [

. . . .

84 perhaps κ]αλεῖτα[ι || 89 trace before ν resembles the right-hand corner of δ and ω (cf. ω in l. 79 and 110); trace after ν is one speck; *pace* ed. pr.,]c Εὐάδνη[c cannot be read

fr. 4

. . . . . .
Βορέ[ου δόλιχον Κάλαις Βο-
ρέου δία[υλον Κάcτωρ Τυν-
δάρεω c[τάδιον Πολυδεύ-
κ]ηc Τυ[νδάρεω πυγμὴν
. . . . . .

fr. 5 (a + b + c + d) col. I

. . . .
] .
ἀποκτεί]νει δὲ Λύ-
κον Θρ]ᾶικα Βέλ-
λεροφόντηc Γλαύκ]ου ἵππωι
κέλητι Ἰόλαος]ἅρμα-
τι τελείῳ Ἴφικλος Φυλ]άκου
cυνωρίδι πωλικῇ] Εὔρυτο[c
Ἑρμοῦ τόξῳ Αἰνεὺ]c Ἑρμοῦ
cφενδόνῃ Κέφαλος Δηι]όν[οc
. . . .

col. II

. . . .
]. . . [
] . . . . η[
] . . . ἐπὶ Πα[τρόκλῳ
τα ἐν Τροία[ι Δι]ομήδη[c Τυδέ-
ωc ἅρματι Ὀδ[υ]ccεὺc [Λαέρ-
του δρόμον [Ὀδυ]ccεύ[c καὶ
Αἴαc Τελαμῶνοc πυ[
. . . .] Ἐ[π]ειὸc Πανοπηι . [
. . . .] . Διομήδ[ηc]λ[
7] . Τελα[μ-
8]με . [
. . . .

112]λ[:] . [ed. pr.

fr. 6

. . . . . .

] ἐ̣ν̣ [ʼΙ]cθμ̣ῷ̣ι̣ [ἐπὶ Μελικέρτῃ
]τῶι ʼΑθάμαντ̣[οc

fr. 7 (a + b)

. . . . . .

] . . [
] . π[
]ε̣ι . [
] . α . [
] . . [
ἕβδομοc] ἀγὼν̣ ὃν[
ἐ]πὶ Πέλοπ̣[ι
]ʼΑλκμήν̣[ηc
ὄγ]δο[ο]c ἀγὼ[ν
ἐν Νεμ]έαι ἐπʼ ʼΑρχ̣[εμόρῳ

. . . . . .

fr. 8

. . . . .

. [
ω ἵππῳι̣[
Διὸc cτ̣ά̣[διον
. . . . . [

. . . . .

fr. 9

. . . . .

]ου̣ δ̣ί̣c̣κ̣[ῳ

fr. 10

. . . . . .

] . . [.] . [
]ν̣ τὸ πρῶτον̣ α̣[
]ἐν ʼΑρείωι Πάγ[ῳ̣
]c̣ ῎Αρει προc . [
]α̣ κτεί̣ναν̣τ̣[

. . . . . .

]ν̣ :] . ed. pr.

fr. 11

] . . . [.] . . [
θυ]γατέρα α̣[
] . οc ἀγων̣[
ʼΑθή]ναιc εν . [
] . . τωι . [
]κ̣τ̣είναν̣[τ-
] . . . ο̣υ̣ . . [
Εὐ]παλάμο[υ
]ἐγένετο[
ἐν ʼΑ]ρ̣είωι Πάγῳ̣[ι

]. . . . . . . [
]. . ταιμη[
]εωϲ . η . [
]. ωνε̣[
]ω̣ν̣ . [
]. . . [
. . . . .

140 εν . [, one dot after εν : ἐν ᾿Α̣[ρείωι Πάγωι ed. pr.

fr. 12 col. I

. . . .

]α̣κ̣ . . []ϲ
]. γη[
]. . κ̣α̣ . ο̣
]. . α̣ . [
]. . [.] . εν̣ηρα
]. ο̣ν̣υ̣ϲου
]κ̣ληϲ >
]. . [
. . . .

col. II

. . . . .
μ̣ει̣ . [
]. ολ[
]. . [.]ν̣[
. .]η . . [
. . . . ε . [Λε-
βαδεια̣[-
μαν̣τ̣ε̣[
]. π̣ . [
]. [
. . . . .

158] Δ̣ι̣ο̣ . ὕϲου ed. pr. || 164 . [, α (ed. pr.) or δ || 165 . . ν̣γε . [ed. pr. : instead of ν perhaps α or λ; instead of γ perhaps τ

fr. 13

. . . . .
](). ι̣ουε[
]. νω[
]ο̣υενΤ . [
]. ουτ . [
]μιθε . [
]ηλθ̣ . ν̣[
. . . . .

fr. 14

. . . . .
]. . α̣χ̣ . [
]. ντα[.]δ . . . . ε̣τ̣υ̣μ̣ο̣[
]. χ . ν̣[.] . ϲ̣ . . α . δ̣η[
. . . . .

170]().,]ν or] . ι̣ (ed. pr.)

fr. 15

. . . . .
]. . ναπ . [
]ω̣ν[.]μα[
]κυ . [.] . [
. . . . .

fr. 16

. . . . .
]. . ιδεα̣ . [
]. κ̣ . [
]δ̣ι̣ο̣ϲ̣ . . [
]. . . υ̣[
. . . . .

fr. 17 col. I col. II

. . . .

col. I	col. II
	.[
] . λη . [	εις . ['Η-
] . . [	ρ̣α̣κ̣λ̣[ῆς
]α̣ν̣τ̣[	διο . [
	] . . [

. . . .

col. ii 187ff. traces of coronis

fr. 18

. . .
] . . [
] . ν . ρ̣ . [
] . ηcα[
. . .

fr. 19

. . .
oc . [.] . [
ω̣α̣c . . [
] . [
. . .

fr. 20

. . .
] . . χι̣α . [
] . υ̣π̣[.] . [

fr. 21

. . .
] . [
]ρκα . ν̣ . [

fr. 22

. . .
] . [.] . [
] . ι̣η . [
] . αν̣[
. . .

fr. 23

. . .
] . . [
] . . . ε . . . [
] . [
. . .

fr. 24

. . .
] . ευ . [
] . ο̣[.] . . [
] . η . . [
]α̣ιο . [

fr. 25

. . .
] . ε̣υ̣[
] . ετ . [
]α . . [
] . . [
. . .

fr. 26

. . .
] . [
] . ιαι . [
] . . [
. . .

210 . [, bottom of round letter : ιο . δ̣[ed. pr.

fr. 27

(upper margin?)
]δ̣[
. .

70 *P.Mich.* inv. 1447 ?, II-III

ed. pr. T. Renner, A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses, *HSPh* 82, 1978, 277-293 incl. pl.
cf. Merkelbach-West (1990) frr. 10(d), 188A, 217A; cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 6

Contents: list of metamorphoses

Col. I = Fr. 2 + Fr. 1

. . . .

]. . . . . . [. .] .
]. . . ϲ̣χαριζο
]. . π̣ρ̣αξαι
]. . . . ε̣λεγ
]. . μ̣ορφιαν
]. . . . ε̣ . ω̣γ̣
]. . . η . . ν̣ .
]. . . [. .] . μ̣ο̣
]ϲ̣ .

]. . [. .]κτηϲ
]ευϲ
]εντοϲ
]αδε
]ηϲ̣ταϲ
]ηλθεν
]θηυφη
]. . μετε
]. . ρνε
] . τοτοζ̣ω
]περιται

]τωι̣κεκρο̣
]. . . νηϲ̣ .

13 ε̄

Col. II = Frr. 1, 3, 4

. . . .

ʼΑκταίων ὁ ʼΑριϲταί[ο]υ καὶ Αὐ[τονόηϲ, τῶν Ϲεμέ-
ληϲ ἐφιέμενοϲ γάμων αυτ[

το πρὸϲ τοῦ μητροπάτορο[ϲ *μετεμορ-*
φώθη εἰ[ϲ] *ἐλάφου δόκηϲιν διὰ βο*[*υλὴν*] *᾿Αρτέμ*[*ι-*
δοϲ καὶ διεϲπαράϲθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐ[*α*]*υτ*[*οῦ*] *κυνῶν, ὥ*[ϲ
φηϲιν ῾Ηϲίοδοϲ *ἐν* Γυναικῶν Κα[*τ*]αλ[ό]*γωι.*
>——
᾿*Αρέθουϲα θυγατὴρ μὲν* ῾Υπέρ[ο]υ, Π[οϲ]ει[*δῶνι δὲ ϲυν-*
ελθοῦϲ[*α*] *κατὰ τὸν* Βοϊκὸν Εὔριπον, [*εἰϲ κρήνην*
ἠλλάγη ἐν Χ[*αλκίδι*] *ὑπὸ* [*τῆϲ*] ῞Ηραϲ, *ὡϲ* ῾Ηϲίοδοϲ *ἱϲτορε*[*ῖ*
>——
Αἴθυιαι ᾿Αλιάκμονοϲ *τοῦ* ᾿Αλιάρτου *θυγατ*[*έρεϲ*
ἑπτὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν θρηνοῦϲαι τὴν ᾿Ινὼ *μ*[*ετε-*
μορφώθηϲαν ὑπὸ ῞Ηραϲ *εἰϲ* . [.] . ρ[.] . . . . [. .] . . [
παρ᾿ Αἰϲχύλωι *καλοῦνται μιϲοκόρων*[*οι*
>——
᾿*Αλκυόνην τὴν* Αἰόλου *ἔγημε* Κῆ[*υξ*] *ὁ* Φωϲφό-
ρου τοῦ ἀϲτέροϲ υἱόϲ. ἄμφω δ᾿ ἦϲα[*ν ὑπερή*]*φα*[*νοι, ἀλ-*
λήλων δ᾿ ἐραϲθέντεϲ η[. . . .] . α . [.] . [.]ρνα[
Δία *κα*[λ]εῖ, *αὐτὴν* ῞Ηραν *προϲηγό*[*ρε*]*υεν· ἐφ᾿* [*ᾧ ὀργι-*
ϲθεὶ[ϲ] *ὁ* Ζεὺϲ *μετεμόρφωϲεν ἀμφοτέρουϲ* [*εἰϲ ὄρ-*
νε[*α*,] *ὡϲ* ῾Ηϲίοδοϲ *ἐν* Γυναικῶν Καταλόγωι[
>——
᾿Αϲκάλαφοϲ *ὁ* ᾿Αχέροντοϲ *καὶ* Γοργύραϲ, Δή[*μητροϲ*
εὑρούϲηϲ τὴν Κόρην . [. .]*υνθενηι τῶι* Πλ[*ούτωνι*
margin of 4.5 cm

23-28 cf. Merkelbach-West fr. 217A || 23 *αριϲτει*[.]*ν* || 24-25 *κατηρᾶ*]*το πρὸϲ τοῦ μητροπάτορο*[ϲ *Κάδμου καὶ* Merkelbach || 27 *διεϲπε-* || 28 *-γωι.* || 29-31 cf. Merkelbach-West fr. 188A || 30 *βοϊ-* : ⟨*Εὐ*⟩*βοϊκὸν* Lloyd-Jones (1979: 6) | *ευρει-* || 31 *ηλλαγη* *εν* Χ[*αλκιδι*]/ *υπο* || 33 *ἰνω* || 35 *παρα-* ⟦ϲ⟧*ιϲχυλ-* | *καλου**ν*/*ται* || 36-41 cf. Merkelbach-West fr. 10(d) || 37 *υἱοϲ* || 38 *ἡ* [*μὲν*] . *α* . [.] *κ* [.]*ρνα*[Merkelbach-West || 39 *ὁ δὲ* add. West before *αὐτὴν* || 41 *ὡϲ* || 42 *-γυρηϲ* || 43 *μ*[*ην*]*υνθέν, ἧι* Burkert ap. Renner : [*καὶ* ϲ]*υνθε*<*μέ*>*νηϲ* Lloyd-Jones (1979: 6)

71 *P.Oxy.* 61, 4098 Oxyrhynchus, III

ed. pr. R.L. Fowler, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 61, London 1995, 54-55 + pl. VIII
* inspexi

Contents: list of people killed by Heracles

. . . .

] . ν̣[ ] . [ ]
]πελαcγείαc[
]θ̣[.] . αc ἀνεῖλεν ᾿Α-
μύντορα τὸν ᾿Ορμένου μὲν
υἱὸν Φοίνικοc δὲ πατέρα
Κτέατον καὶ Εὔρυ[τον] τοὺc
Μολίνηc καὶ ᾿Α̣[κτορί]ω-
νοc διφυεῖc ὄν̣[ταc κ]αὶ ὑ-
βριcτὰc ἀν̣θ̣ρ̣ώ̣[πουc]
Τηλέγο̣ν̣ο̣ν̣ τ̣[ὸν Πρωτ]έωc

. . . .

3 above αcαν is] . . [] . [, cf. ed. pr. || 7 μολει-

72 *P.Oxy.* 62, 4307 Oxyrhynchus, II

ed. pr. M.A. Harder, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 62, London 1995, 49-50 + pl. VI
* inspexi

Contents: list of mothers who killed their children

] . κ̣υ̣ . .
] . . . [ ] . . .
]ν̣αν Πρ̣ό̣κ̣[νη Παν]δίονοc
῎Ι̣τυν Τήρ̣ε̣ω̣c̣ . . . . [.] Μή-
δεια Αἰήτου τ̣ο̣ὺ̣c̣ [᾿Ιά]c̣ο̣ν̣ο̣c̣
παῖδαc ὀργῇ˙ ε̣ . . [.] . . . [Κά-
δμου Μελικέρτην ᾿Αθα̣-
μαντοc λυπῇ˙ ᾿Αλθαία [Θεcτίου
Μελέαγρον Ο̣ἰ̣ν̣έ̣[ω]c̣[
] . . . . [

. . . .

1-2 above]δειονοc in l. 3 is ca. 3.5 cm of blank papyrus with traces of two more lines of writing (not observed in ed. pr. where ἐκτει- is supplemented at the end of l. 2) || 1 κ̣υ̣ (instead of υ perhaps τ) is preceded by a slightly curved upright and followed by a few dots (of a narrow letter) and a round letter || 2 vague traces compatible with suppl. ed. pr. (see above) || 6 -γη˙ || 8 -πη˙ | -θαι . \α/[

73 *P.Corn.* 55 ?, I

ed. pr. W.L. Westermann-C.J. Kraemer Jr., *Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University*, New York 1926, 246
re-edited by L. Salvadori Baldascino, *Aegyptus* 70, 1990, 205-210 incl. pl.
cf. Pack 2646; Henrichs (1987: 250 + n. 34)
* Text is based on the second edition which is more complete than the first though based on a photograph

Contents: list of mythical men connected with the cult of gods

Col. I

. . . . . .
] . [
]λ[
. κ . . [
καὶ Α[
Τριπτόλεμο[c οἱ μὲν
Κελεοῦ [οἱ δὲ Δ]υc-
αύλου καὶ Βαυροῦc
οἱ δὲ Γῆc καὶ Οὐρανοῦ
ʼΡαδάμανθυc Διὸc
καὶ Εὐρώπηc
Μουcαῖοc ʼΑντιοφή(μου) ?
Εὔμολπoc Μουcαίου
Τροφώνιοc ʼΑπόλλωνοc
. . . . .]νημ[.]νεων
. . . . .]cτοι
. . . .

Col. II

. . . .
. [
κ[
ο . [
ογ . [
πα[
π . [
κ . [
. [
. [
[.] . [
α[.] . [
μ . . [
. ?[
. . . .

7 Βαυροῦc (cf. Β . . αυρουc ed. pr. and B[r]auro Henrichs in Engl. transcript) instead of Βαυβοῦc, cf. re-ed. p. 208 || 14 sic papyrus : [ἱερομ]νημ[ό]νων Salvadori Bald.

74 *P.Vindob.G.* inv. 26727 ?, II

ed. pr. P.J. Sijpesteijn-K.A. Worp, Literary and Semi-Literary Papyri, *CE* 49, 1974, 317-24
cf. Merkelbach-West (1990) fr. 10(e)
* I have examined a xerox of this papyrus

Contents: 1-4 Halirrhothius; 5-8 daughters of Dorus; 9-12 ?; 13-16 Leucippus' daughters; 19-23 Thestius' children; 24-25 Oenotropoi

. . . .
]᾿Αλ̣ιρ̣ρ̣[όθιος
]. δων[. .]α̣. νύμφη[
]. ης βι̣[α .]μ̣ένης ὑπ̣[
]ἀπεσφάγη
ε̄ θυγα]τ̣έρες, αἳ τοῖς θεοῖς μ[ιχθεῖσαι Νύμφας καὶ
Κουρῆτ]α̣ς καὶ Σατύρους ἐγέν[νησαν
]᾿Αγαυὴ Οὐκαλέγουσα . [
᾿Ιφθ]ί̣μη
]. ν ὀνόματα
]φων ὀνόματα τῶν . [
]γ̣ενομένων αἳ καλοῦν[ται
]. Αἴγλη Εὐφρόνη παν[
Λευκιππ]ίδες ᾿Αμφιθέας καὶ Λευ̣[κίππου
Κάστωρ] καὶ Πολυδεύκης ἔσχον[
]. Φ̣ο̣ίβη ᾿Ιλάρα ᾿Αρσινόη[
] . . [
] [
] [
Θε]σ̣τίου καὶ τῆς Λευρωνος λε̣[
]ί̣[ο]υ̣ θυγάτηρ μὲν ῾Υπερμν̣[ήστρα
]. υἱὸς δὲ ῎Ιφικλος Εὔιππο[ς
Πλ]ήξιππος Εὐρύπυλος Αραν̣[
]α̣έθων Π̣ροκόων
Οἰνό]τροποι
]δε ᾿Ανίου τοῦ ᾿Απόλλωνος . [

υαπ . .

1]᾿Αλ̣ιρ̣ρ̣[όθιος T. Idgenhorst (cf. comm.) || 2] . , low horizontal | α̣ followed by foot of upright || 3] . , τ (ed. pr.) or π | ὑπ || 5-8 suppl. Merkelbach-West, fr. 10(e); cf. suggestions in ed. pr.); the length of the lines is uncertain: they may have contained more text at the beginning and less at the end, etc. || 5 -ρες αι || 7 αγλαυη ου- | -λεουσα corr. by Merkelbach-West || 8]ιμηι || 13]ιδες αμ- || 14 -κης εσ- || 15 ϊλαρα αρ- || 16-18 space for three lines of writing: the horizontal fibres of the greater part of lines 16 and 17 have worked loose from the vertical layer underneath and are now lost. Only at the end of line 16 are some traces of ink. The line below

this damaged part (l. 18) may have been empty or it may have contained a kind of heading at the beginning (lost) though this must have been very small. || 19 prob. ⟨Π⟩λευρῶνος followed by name of female || 20 ϋπερ- || 26 second hand

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is a list of works which are cited in Part One. More bibliographical references accompany the papyrus texts.

Abel E., *Scholia recentia in Pindari Epinicia* 1, Budapesti/Berolini 1891

Achelis Th.O.H., De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum, *Philologus* 72, 1913, 414-441 and 73, 1914, 122-153

Alfonsi L., Sui Papyri Schubart, *Aegyptus* 33, 1953, 297-314

Allen T.W., *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*, Oxford 1921

Arrighetti G., Hypomnemata e Scholia: alcuni problemi, *MPhL* 2, 1977, 49-67

Austin: Austin C., *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin 1968

——, *CGFPR* = *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin/New York 1973

Bachmann L., *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, Leipzig 1835

Bäcker E., *De canum nominibus graecis*, Diss. Regensburg 1884

Bagnall R.S., *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993

Bal M., *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen*, Muiderberg 1978

——, Eng. translation by C. van Boheemen, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, Toronto 1985

Bardon H., *La littérature latine inconnue* 1, Paris 1952

Barri N., Greek Historical Present in a Double Verbal System, *Linguistics* 204, 1978, 43-56

Barrett W.S., The Epitome of Euripides' *Phoinissai*: Ancient and Medieval Versions, *CQ* n.s. 15, 1965, 58-71

Bekker I., *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, Berlin 1825-7

Bethe E., *Quaestiones Diodoreae Mythographae*, Diss. Göttingen 1887

Blanchard A., Sur le milieu d'origine du papyrus Bodmer de Ménandre, *CE* 66, 1991, 211-220

Blum F., *De Antonino Liberali*, Diss. Frisingae 1892

Blum R., *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen*, Frankfurt am Main 1977

Blumenthal A. von, s.v. Parthenios nr. 15, *RE* 18.4, 1949, 1895-1899

Boeuffle A. Le, *Hygin. L'Astronomie*, Paris 1983

Bonner S.F., *Education in Ancient Rome*, London 1977

Breen A.B., *The Fabulae Hygini Reappraised: a Reconsideration of the Content and Compilation of the Work*, Diss. Urbana, Illinois 1991

——, forthcoming in *ANRW* II. 34.4: Studies in the 'Fabulae' of Hyginus: An Investigation into Sources, Structure, and Method

Bremmer J.N., Oedipus and the Greek Oedipus Complex, in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (ed. J.N. Bremmer), London/Sydney 1987, 41-59

Brodersen K., *Reiseführer zu den Sieben Weltwundern*, Frankfurt a. M./Leipzig 1992

Brown A.L., The Dramatic Synopses Attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium, *CQ* 37, 1987, 427-431

Brunt P.A., On Historical Fragments and Epitomes, *CQ* n.s. 30, 1980, 477-494

Budé: Budé A.W.A.M., *De hypotheseis der Griekse tragedies en komedies. Een onderzoek naar de hypotheseis van Dicaearchus*, Diss. Nijmegen 1977

Bühler W., *Zenobii Athoi proverbia* 1, Göttingen 1987

Bulloch A.W., *Callimachus. The fifth Hymn*, Cambridge 1985

Butler H.E., *Quintilian* 1, (Loeb) Cambridge 1958

Calderini A., Commenti 'minori' al testo di Homero in documenti egiziani, *Aegyptus* 2, 1921, 303-326

Cameron A., *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton 1995

Carrara P., Dicearco e l'hypothesis del Reso, *ZPE* 90, 1992, 35-44

Carrière J.-C.-B. Massonie, *La Bibliothèque d'Apollodore*, Paris 1991

Carter C.J., II. Valerius Maximus, in *Empire and Aftermath. Silver Latin* II (ed. T.A. Dorey), London/Boston 1975, 26-56

Casparis C.P., *Tense Without Time. The Present Tense in Narration*, Bern 1975

Castiglioni L., *Papiri della R. Università di Milano (PRIMI)* 1, Milan 1937, 146-154

Clarysse W., Literary Papyri in Documentary 'Archives', in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* = *Studia Hellenistica* 27, Leuven 1983, 43-61

Clarysse W.-A. Wouters, A Schoolboy's Exercise in the Chester Beatty Library, *Ancient Society* 1, 1970, 201-235

Collard C.-M.J. Cropp-K.H. Lee, *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays* I, Warminster 1995

Colson F.H., *M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber I*, Cambridge 1924

CPF I.1: F. Adorno et al., *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini* I.1, Firenze 1989

Cribiore R., *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, Atlanta 1996 (*Am. Stud. Pap.* 36)

Daly L.W., *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Bruxelles 1967

Davies M., *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1988

Début J., De l'usage des listes de mots comme fondement de la pédagogie dans l'antiquité, *REA* 85, 1983, 261-274

Demandt A., *Die Spätantike: römische Geschichte von Diocletian bis Justinian, 284-565 n. Chr.*, München 1989

Dietze J., *Quaestiones Hyginianae*, Diss. Kiel 1890

Diggle J., *Euripides Fabulae* I-III, Oxford 1981-1994 (= OCT)

——, The Papyrus Hypothesis of Euripides' Orestes, *ZPE* 77, 1989, 1-11

——, *Euripidea: Collected Essays*, Oxford 1994

Dihle A., *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit: von Augustus bis Justinian*, München 1989

Diller A., The Text History of the Bibliotheca of Pseudo-Apollodorus, *TAPhA* 66, 1935, 296-313 (= *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition*, Amsterdam 1983, 199-216)

Ddf. I, II: Dindorf W., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I, II Oxford 1875

Ddf. Od. I, II: Dindorf W., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* I, II, Oxford 1855

Dobesch G., Die Interpolationen aus Apollodors Bibliotheke in der Sprichwörtersammlung des Pseudo-Zenobios, *WS* 78, 1965, 58-82

Eichholtz P., *De scriptoribus περὶ εὑρημάτων*, Halle 1867

Erbse H. et alii, *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung* 1, Zürich 1961

Erbse: Erbse H., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*, Berlin 1969-1988

FGrHist: Jacoby F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923-1958

Foerster R., *Libanii opera* VIII, Lipsiae 1915

Forbes Irving P.M.C., *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths*, Oxford 1990

Fornara C.W., *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Berkeley/ L.A./London 1983

Gaisford T., *Poetae minores graeci* III, Oxford 1820

Gallavotti C., *RIFC* 61, 1933, 177-188 (= *ed. pr.* of *PSI* 12, 1286)

Gallazzi C., La 'Cantina dei Papiri' di Tebtynis e ciò che essa conteneva, *ZPE* 80, 1990, 283-288
Garvie A.F., *Aeschylus' Supplices, Play and Trilogy*, Cambridge 1969
GMAW : Turner E.G., *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, sec. revised and enlarged ed. by P.J. Parsons, London 1987
Götz G., *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* III, Leipzig 1892
——, s.v. Dositheos 8, *RE* 5, 1905, 1606-1607
Green R.P.H., *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford 1991
Grilli A., I cani d'Atteone. Igino e il P.Med. inv. 123—la tradizione poetica, *PP* 26, 1971, 354-367
Häussler R., Grundzüge antiker Mythographie, in W. Killy (ed.), *Mythographie der frühen Neuzeit. Ihre Anwendung in den Künsten*, (*Wolfenbütteler Forschungen* 27) Wiesbaden 1984, 1-23
Hamburger K., *Die Logik der Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1968^2 (*ed. pr.* 1957)
——, *The Logic of Literature*, 2nd, revised ed., Bloomington 1973
Hamilton R., A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: The Hypothesis of Euripides' "Alexandros", *AJPh* 97, 1976, 65-70
Handley E.W., *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London 1965
——, POxy 2806: a Fragment of Cratinus?, *BICS* 29, 1982, 109-117
Harder M.A., A new identification in P.Oxy. 2455?, *ZPE* 35, 1979, 7-14
Harrauer H.-P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Neue Texte aus dem antiken Unterricht*, (*MPER N.S.* 15), Wien 1985
Haslam M.W., The Authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1-2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1, *GRBS* 16, 1975, 149-174
——, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 53, 3702, London 1986, 31-40
——, A New Papyrus of the Mythographus Homericus, *BASP* 27, 1990, 31-36
——, The *Hypotheses* of Dikaiarchos, *APA* Abstracts, 1994, 211
Hemelryck R. van, Een collectie narratieve tragediehypotheseis: de Tales from Euripides, *Handelingen der Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* 33, 1979, 289-300
Henrichs A., Philodems *De Pietate* als mythographische Quelle, *CronErc* 5, 1975, 5-38
——, Three Approaches to Greek Mythography, in J.N. Bremmer, *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London/Sydney 1987, 242-277
Henry R., *Photius Bibliothèque* III, Paris 1962
Hercher R., Zur Textkritik der Verwandlungen des Ant. Lib., *Hermes* 12, 1877, 306-319
Hollis A.S., Teuthis in Callimachus' Aetia (P.Mich.Inv. 6235), *ZPE* 92, 1992, 115-117
Holwerda D., Zur szenisch-technischen Bedeutung des Wortes 'ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ', in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*, Amsterdam 1976, 173-198
——, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983, 173-176 (review of Budé)
Horsfall N., Stesichorus at Bovillae?, *JHS* 99, 1979, 26-48
——, *Tabulae Iliacae* in the Collection Froehner, Paris, *JHS* 103, 1983, 144-147
Huys M., P.Oxy. 61. 4099: A Combination of Mythographic Lists with Sentences of the Seven Wise Men, *ZPE* 113, 1996, 205-212
——, Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus?, *APF* 42, 1996, 168-178
——, Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of the *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus? Part II, *APF* 43.1, 1997, 11-30

——, Euripides and the 'Tales from Euripides': Sources of Apollodoros' 'Bibliotheca'?, *RhM* 1997 (forthcoming)
Jacobs J., *De Progymnamasticorum studiis mythographicis*, Diss. Marburg 1899
Jahn O.-A. Michaelis, *Griechische Bilderchroniken*, Bonn 1873
James M.R., A Manual of Mythology in the Clementines, *JThS* 33, 1932, 262-265
Johnson W.A., *The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions. An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus*, Diss. Yale 1992
Jong de I., *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam 1987
Kassel R., Hypothesis, in *Scholia. Studia ... D. Holwerda oblata* (ed. W.J. Aerts e.a.), Groningen 1985, 53-59 (= *Kl. Schr.* 207-214)
KG: R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II Satzlehr, 3. Aufl. von B. Gerth, Hannover/Leipzig 1898-1904
Kirk G.S., *The Iliad: A Commentary II* (books 5-8), Cambridge 1990
Kleingünther A., Πρῶτος Εὑρετής. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung, *Philologus* Suppl. 26.1, 1933
Körte A., Die Hypothesis zur Kratinos' Dionysalexandros, *Hermes* 39, 1904, 481-498
——, Die *περιοχαὶ τῶν Μενάνδρου δραμάτων* des Homeros Sellios, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 38, 1918, 787-791
——, s.v. Sellios, *RE* 2 A,1923, 1321-1322
Koster W.J.W., De Aristophane Byzantio argumentorum metricorum auctore, in *Charisteria Fr. Novotný Octogen. oblata* (edd. F. Stiebitz-R. Hošek), Praha 1962, 43-50
Kremmer M., *De catalogis Heurematum*, Diss. Leipzig 1890
Krenn J., *Interpretationen zu den Hypothesen in den Euripideshandschriften*, Inaugural-Diss. Graz 1971
Krevelen van D.A., Zu Hyginus, *Philologus* 112, 1968, 269-275
Krüger J., *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption*, Frankfurt am Main 1990
Lafaye G., *Études sur les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, Paris 1904
Lascaris J., *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem quae vocantur Didymi*, Roma 1517
Lesky A., *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern 1957/58
Leutsch E.L. von-F.G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* 1, Göttingen 1839 (repr. 1965)
LIMC: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich 1981-
LSJ: H.G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. A new edition ... by H.S. Jones ..., Oxford 1940
Luce T.J., *Livy. The Composition of his History*, Princeton 1977
Lünstedt P., *Untersuchungen zu den mythologischen Abschnitten der D-Scholien*, Diss. Hamburg 1961 (unpublished)
Luppe W., Die Hypothesis zu Kratinos' Dionysalexandros, *Philologus* 110, 1966, 169-193
——, P.Oxy. 3160 + P.Strassb. 1401- Bruchstücke derselben Odyssee-Erläuterungen, *ZPE* 27, 1977, 101-106
——, Der Temenos-Papyrus. P.Mich.inv.nr. 1319, *Philologus* 122, 1978, 6-13
——, Die Odyssee-Hypotheseis im P.Ryl. 23 (Nr. 1208 Pack[2]), *APF* 27, 1980, 33-35
——, Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' Elektra. P.Oxy. 420 (Nr. 388 Pack[2]), *Philologus* 125, 1981, 181-187
——, Die Hypothesis zum 'Rhesos'. *PSI* 1286, Kolumne I, *Anagennesis* 2.1, 1982, 74-82

——, Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' Auge, *APF* 29, 1983, 19-23
——, Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' 'Phaëthon' im Pap. Oxy. 2455, *Philologus* 127, 1983, 135-139
——, Die Hypothesis zu Euripides' 'Hippolytos', *Philologus* 127, 1983, 155-162
——, Epikureische Mythenkritik bei Philodem—Götterliebschaften in PHerc. 243 II und III, *BCPE* (= *CronErc*) 14, 1984, 109-124
——, Achilleus bei Lykomedes in P.Berol. 13930 (Pack² 1203), *APF* 31, 1985, 5-11
——, Dikaiarchos' *ὑποθέcειc τῶν Εὐριπίδου μύθων* (mit einem Beitrag zur 'Troades'-Hypothesis), in *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung, Paul Moraux gewidmet*, Berlin-New York 1985, 610-615
——, Die MHΔEIA-Hypothesis, *Anagennesis* 4.1, 1986, 37-58
——, Der Umfang der euripideischen Papyrus-Hypotheseis (mit einem Beitrag zur 'Hypsipyle'-Hypothesis, *ZPE* 72, 1988, 27-33
——, Dikaiarchos und der 'Rhesos'-Prolog, *ZPE* 84, 1990, 11-13
——, Literarische Texte. Drama, *APF* 37, 1991, 83 (on 1a)
——, Zwei Kürzungen in der mittelalterlichen "Andromache"-Hypothesis, *ZPE* 90, 1992, 45-47
——, *Gnomon* 64, 1992, 291-293 (review of P.Oxy. 56, 3830)
——, Die Hypothesis zum ersten 'Hippolytos' (P.Mich.inv. 6222A), *ZPE* 102, 1994, 23-39
Maass E., Analecta Eratosthenica, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 6, Berlin 1883
MacCary W.T., Menander's characters: their names, roles and masks, *TAPhA* 101, 1970, 277-290
Maehler H.-G. Cavallo, *Greek Bookhands of the early Byzantine period A.D. 300-800*, (Bull. Suppl. 47), London 1987
Marrou H.I., *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1948
Marshall P.K., *Hyginus Fabulae*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1993
Martini E., *Parthenii Nicaeni quae supersunt*, Lipsiae 1902
Mayer-G'Schrey R., *Parthenius Nicaeensis quale in fabularum amatoriarum breviario dicendi genus secutus sit*, Diss. Heidelberg 1898
McNamee K., *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca*, Ann Arbor 1981 (*BASP* Suppl. 3)
Meijering R., *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*, Groningen 1987
Merkelbach R., Referate. Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der christlichen, *APF* 16, 1956, 82-129
Merkelbach R.-M.L. West, *Hesiodi. Fragmenta Selecta*, Oxford 1990³
Michel G., *De fabularum graecarum argumentis metricis*, Gissae 1908
Montanari F., *Studi di filologia omerica antica* I, Pisa 1979
——, Sulle hypotheseis di Odyss. *β* e *γ* di P.Oxy. 3160 + P.Strasb.Gr. 1401, *SCO* 31, 1981, 101-110 (= 1995 *Studi*: 103-111)
——, P. Pis. inv. 1 e P. Bonon. 6 in rapporto con le hypotheseis dei canti omerici, *Anagennesis* 2, 1982, 273-284 (=1995 *Studi*: 87-95)
——, P.Oxy. 574 verso riconsiderato: frammento di hypotheseis dell' Iliade, *ZPE* 48, 1982, 89-92 (= 1995 *Studi*: 97-102)
——, Revisione di *PBerol.* 13282. Le *historiae fabulares* omeriche su papiro, in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 1983*, Napoli 1984, 2. 229-242 (= 1995 *Studi*: 113-125)
——, Note sulla tradizione manoscritta degli Scholia D in Iliadem. Un caso di errore da archetipo, in *Storia Poesia e Pensiero nel mondo antico (Studi in onore di Marcello Gigante)*, Napoli 1994, 475-481 (= 1995 *Studi*: 147-152)
——, The Mythographus Homericus, in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle. A Collection of Papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld* (eds. J.G.J. Abbenes,

S.R. Slings, I. Sluiter), Amsterdam 1995, 135-172
——, *Studi di filologia omerica antica* II, Pisa 1995
Montefusco L.C., *Exordium Narratio Epilogus. Studi sulla teoria retorica greca e romana delle parti del discorso*, Bologna 1988
Montevecchi O., *La Papirologia*, Milano 1973
Naber S.A., *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* I, Leiden 1864
Nachmanson E., *Der griechische Buchtitel*, Göteborg 1941
Nauck: Nauck A., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Supplementum continens nova Fragmenta Euripidea et Adespota ... adiecit B. Snell*, Hildesheim 1964
Nelson G.A.-J.L. Raymond, Papyrus Bodmer IV: The Distinction of Hands and the Date, *BASP* 4, 2, 1967, 43-48
Oder E., *De Antonino Liberali*, Diss. Bonn 1886
OLD: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1968-1982
Pack: R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin literary texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, second revised and enlarged edition, Ann Arbor 1965
Palm J., *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa*, Lund 1955
Panzer J., *De Mythographo Homerico restituendo*, Diss. Greifswald 1892
Papadopulos-Kerameus A., Apollodori Bibliothecae fragmenta Sabbaitica, *RhM* n.f. 46, 1891, 161-192
Papathomopoulos M., *Antoninus Liberalis, Les Métamorphoses*, Paris 1968
——, Pour une nouvelle édition de la Bibliothèque d'Apollodore, *Hellenica* 26, 1973, 18-40
Parca M.G., *Ptocheia or Odysseus in Disguise at Troy (P.Köln VI 245)*, (= *Am. Stud. Pap.* 31), Atlanta 1991
PCG: Kassel R.-Austin C., *Poetae Comici Graeci*, Berlin/New York 1983-1995
Pfeiffer R., Hesiodisches und Homerisches, *Philologus* 92, 1937, 14-16
Pf.: ——, *Callimachus. Fragmenta* I,II, Oxford 1949-1953
——, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968
PMG: Page D.L., *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962
Priest N.E., A List of Gods (P.Mich. inv. 2458), *ZPE* 27, 1977, 193-200
Rabe H., Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften, *RhM* 63, 1908, 144-147
Radermacher L., Aristophanes' "Frösche", *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 198.4, Wien 1921
——, *Koine*, (Sitzungsberichte Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien 224) Wien 1947
RE: *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Neue bearbeitung ..., Stuttgart 1894-1978
Regenbogen O., s.v. Πίναξ, *RE* 20, 1950, 1408-1482
Reitzenstein R., s.v. Etymologika, *RE* 6, 1907, 807-817
Renner T., A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses, *HSPh* 82, 1978, 277-293
Riese A., *Geographi Latini minores*, Heilbronn 1878
Risch E., Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern, in *Eumusia. Festgabe für Ernst Howald*, Zürich 1947, 72-91 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin/New York 1981, 294-313)
Robert C., *De Apollodori Bibliotheca*, Diss. Berlin 1873
——, *Eratosthenis Catasterismorum Reliquiae*, Berlin 1878
Roche La J., Zusätze zu den Scholien zur Odysee, *Philologus* 19, 1863, 699-707 + 20, 1863, 711-718
Rohde E., *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig 1914 (3., durch einen zweiten Anhang verm. Aufl.)

Rose H.J., Pseudo-Clement and Ovid, *JThS* 33, 1932, 382-383
——, *Hygini Fabulae*, Leiden 1933
Rose V., *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Stuttgart 1967 (= 1886)
Rossum-Steenbeek M.E. van, More on P.Oxy. LXI 4096, Mythographus Homericus, *ZPE* 113, 1996, 24-26 (= corrected reprint of *ZPE* 112, 1996, 34-36)
Rusten J., Dicaearchus and the *Tales from Euripides*, *GRBS* 23, 1982, 357-367
Sadurska A., *Les Tables Iliaques*, Warschau 1964
Salvadori Baldascino L., Rileggendo P.Cornell 55: un elenco di ieromnemoni mitici?, *Aegyptus* 70, 1990, 205-210
Schepens G., Ancient Paradoxography: origin, evolution, production and reception, in *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino* (edd. O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia), Cassino 1996, 375-409 (these pages are the first part of a lengthy article written together with K. Delcroix, cf. pp. 372-460)
Schimberg A., Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der scholia Didymi I, *Philologus* 49, 1890, 421-456
——, Zur handschr. (...) Didymi II + III, *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu dem Programm des Königl. Evang. Gymnasiums zu Ratibor*, Göttingen 1891 + 1892
Schlesinger A.C., *Livy XIV. Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*, London/Cambridge 1967
Schmidt M., *Didymus Chalcenterus. Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, Lipsiae 1854
Schöne H., Eine umstrittene Wortstellung des Griechischen, *Hermes* 60, 1925, 144-173
Schubart W., *Griechische literarische Papyri*, Berlin 1950
Schwartz E., *De scholiis Homericis ad historiam fabularem pertinentibus*, Leipzig 1881 (Fleckeisens Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie, Suppl. 12, 405-463)
——, s.v. Apollodoros nr. 61, *RE* 1, 1894, 2875-86
Schwartz J., *Pseudo-Hesiodeia*, Leiden 1960
Seider R., *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri* Bd. II, Stuttgart 1970
Sellheim R., *De Parthenii et Antonini fontium indiculorum auctoribus*, Halle 1930
Sicking C.M.J., Taalkundige observaties bij het onderwijs in het Grieks, *Lampas* 27.1, 1994, 4-27
Sijpesteijn P.J., The Rejuvenation Cure of Pelias, *ZPE* 9, 1972, 104-110
Slings S.R., Help, een anakoloet! Zinsstructuur en orale grammatica bij Plato, *Lampas* 29.5, 1996, 426-445
Söder A., *Quellenuntersuchung zum 1. Buch der Apollodorschen Bibliothek*, Diss. Würzburg 1939
Spengel L., *Rhetores Graeci* II, III, Lipsiae 1854-1856
Stanzel F.K., *Theorie des Erzählens*, Göttingen 1979
——, Engl. translation by C. Goedsche, *A Theory of Narrative*, Cambridge 1984
Stephens S.A., Who Read Ancient Novels?, in *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (ed. J. Tatum), Baltimore/London 1994, 405-418
Suda: ed. Adler A., *Suidae lexicon*, Lipsiae 1928-1938
Sutton D.F., Evidence for Lost Dramatic Hypotheses, *GRBS* 29, 1988, 87-92
Tolkiehn J., s.v. Iulius Hyginus, *RE* 10.1, 1917, 636-640
Tomberg K.-H., *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos*, Bonn 1968
Treu K., Antike Literatur im byzantinischen Ägypten im Lichte der Papyri, *ByzSlav* 47, 1986, 1-7
TrGF
1: B. Snell, Didascaliae tragicae, Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, Testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum, ed. correctior et addendis aucta curavit R. Kannicht, Göttingen 1986

2: R. Kannicht-B. Snell, Fragmenta adespota. Indices ad Volumina 1 et 2, Göttingen 1981
3: St. Radt, Aeschylus, Göttingen 1985
4: St. Radt, Sophocles, Göttingen 1977
Turner E.G., Scribes and Scholars of Oxyrhynchus, *Akten des VIII. Intern. Kongresses für Papyrologie*, Wien 1956, 141-146
——, L'érudition alexandrine et les papyrus, *CE* 37, 1962, 135-152
——, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford 1968
——, Oxyrhynchus and Rome, *HSPh* 79, 1975, 1-24
——, *The Typology of the Early Codex*, Pennsylvania Univ. 1977
VdValk: Valk M. van der, On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*, *REG* 71, 1958, 100-168
——, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* 1, Leiden 1963, 303-413
Wachter R., The inscriptions in the François Vase, *MH* 48, 1991, 86-113
Wagner J., *Die metrischen Hypotheseis zu Aristophanes*, Berlin 1908
Wagner R., *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca. Accedunt Curae Mythographae de Apollodori fontibus*, Leipzig 1891
——, *Mythographi Graeci 1. Apollodori Bibliotheca*, Leipzig 1894
Walz C., *Rhetores Graeci*, Stuttgart/Tübingen/London/Paris 1832-1836
Weinrich H., *Tempus. Erzählte und besprochene Welt*, Stuttgart 1964
Wendel C., *Scholia in Theocritum Vetera*, Leipzig 1914
——, *Gnomon* 8, 1932, 148-154 (= review of Sellheim)
——, s.v Mythographie, *RE* 16.2, 1935, 1352-74
——, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, Berolini 1935
Wendling A., *De peplo Aristotelico. Quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Argentorati 1891
West M.L., *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford 1966
——, The Hesiodic Catalogue: New Light on Apollo's Love-Life, *ZPE* 61, 1985, 1-7
Westermann A., *Mythographi scriptores poeticae historiae graeci*, Brunsvigae 1843
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. von, *Analecta Euripidea*, Berlin 1875
——, Homerische Untersuchungen, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 7, Berlin 1884
——, Isyllos von Epidauros, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 9, Berlin 1886
——, *Euripides Herakles* 1, 2 (*Einleitung in die Griechische Tragödie*), Berlin 1895, 1910
——, Die griechische Heldensage I, *Sitzungsberichte der Pr. Akademie der Wissenschaften (ph. hist. klasse)* 7, 1925, 41-62 (= *Kleine Schriften* 5.2, Berlin 1937, 54-84)
——, Über griechische illustrierte Volksbücher, *Kleine Schriften* 5.1, Berlin 1937, 497-501
Wilcken U., *Tafeln zur älteren griechischen Palaeographie*, Leipzig/Berlin 1891
Wille G., *Der Aufbau des Livianischen Geschichtswerks*, Amsterdam 1973
Willis W.H., Athletic Contests in the Epic, *TAPhA* 72, 1941, 392-417
——, A Literary Fragment from the Robinson Collection, *BASP* 5, 1968, 74
Wisse J., The presence of Zeno. The date of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric* and the use of the 'citative' and 'reproducing' present in Latin and Greek, in *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Harm Pinkster* ed. by R. Risselada, J.R. de Jong, A.M. Bolkestein, Amsterdam 1996, 173-202
Wouters A., De literaire papyri en de Griekse literatuur, *Kleio* 5, 1975, 6-29
Zuntz G., *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester 1955

INDICES

The index of papyri contains only references to papyri discussed or mentioned in Part One. The index of passages as well as that of names and subjects includes only items and passages which are discussed at some length in Part One or which occur in the papyri. Numbers between brackets refer to the papyrus texts in Part Two. Many subjects that can be found in the Contents are not enumerated.

INDEX OF PAPYRI

Bodl.Gr.Inscr. 3019 15
JHS 28, 1908, 129 XII, XIII (37) 61
MPER N.S. 1, 17 (57) 101
MPER N.S. 1, 24 (19) 34
MPER N.S. 3, 32 (3) 14
P.Achm. 2 (29) 55
P.Amh. 2, 17 46
P.Amst. 1, 7 (11) 17
P.Ant. 2, 69 (38) 62
P.Berol. inv. 9571 55
P.Berol. inv. 11634 54
P.Berol. inv. 11673 47
P.Berol. inv. 13044 138
P.Berol. inv. 13282 (55) 99
P.Berol. inv. 13930 (54) 98
P.Bodm. 4 (27) 43
P.Bon. 1, 6 (31) 57
P.Bour. 1 44
P.Cair. inv. 43227 (28) 44
P.Cair. inv. 65445 119
P.Chester Beatty 44
P.Colon. inv. 2381 54
P.Corn. 55 (73) 146
P.Duk. inv. 752 (62) 129
P.Giss.Univ. 4, 41 47
P.Giss.Univ. 4, 42 143
P.Hamb. 3, 199 (48) 92
P.Harr. 49 137
P.Harr. 123 38
P.Haun. 1, 7 (59) 122
P.Hercul. 243 III 133
P.Hib. 2, 186 121
P.IFAO inv. 320 56
P.IFAO inv. 337 (24) 41
P.IFAO inv. P.S.P. 248 (9) 16
P.Köln 1, 1 (2) 13
P.Köln 4, 180 59
P.Laur. 3, 53 (41) 65
P.Lond.Lit. 142 (50) 95
P.Med. inv. 123 (65) 133
P.Mich. 6, 390 38
P.Mich. inv. 920a,b + 921 (34) 58
P.Mich. inv. 1315 (36) 61
P.Mich. inv. 1319 (13) 18
P.Mich. inv. 1447 (70) 144
P.Mich. inv. 2458 119
P.Mich. inv. 6222A (7) 15
P.Mich. inv. 6235 (47) 79
P.Mil.Vogl. 1, 18 (43) 75
P.Mil.Vogl. 2, 44 (8) 16
P.Mil.Vogl. 3, 126 (64) 132
P.Oxy. 2, 222 131
P.Oxy. 3, 418 (49) 93
P.Oxy. 3, 420 (6) 15
P.Oxy. 3, 574 (35) 60
P.Oxy. 4, 663 (22) 37
P.Oxy. 4, 665 73
P.Oxy. 5, 843 58
P.Oxy. 8, 1082 58
P.Oxy. 8, 1084 133
P.Oxy. 8, 1086 102
P.Oxy. 9, 1176 58
P.Oxy. 10, 1235 (26) 42
P.Oxy. 10, 1241 (68) 137
P.Oxy. 11, 1399 58
P.Oxy. 13, 1611 94
P.Oxy. 17, 2082 131
P.Oxy. 18, 2192 3
P.Oxy. 20, 2256 (20) 35
P.Oxy. 20, 2257 (21) 36

P.Oxy. 20, 2258 (46) 79
P.Oxy. 20, 2260 141
P.Oxy. 20, 2263 (45) 78
P.Oxy. 21, 2307 102
P.Oxy. 23, 2381 131
P.Oxy. 26, 2451 102
P.Oxy. 27, 2455 (16) 20
P.Oxy. 27, 2457 (1a) 12
P.Oxy. 31, 2534 (23) 41
P.Oxy. 31, 2544 (15) 20
P.Oxy. 35, 2742 102
P.Oxy. 37, 2806 38
P.Oxy. 42, 3003 (52) 97
P.Oxy. 42, 3013 (18) 21
P.Oxy. 44, 3159 (33) 58
P.Oxy. 44, 3160 (39) 62
P.Oxy. 49, 3434 47
P.Oxy. 52, 3648 74
P.Oxy. 52, 3650 (1b) 12
P.Oxy. 52, 3651 (5) 14
P.Oxy. 52, 3652 (14) 19
P.Oxy. 52, 3653 (17) 21
P.Oxy. 53, 3702 (60) 126
P.Oxy. 53, 3710 102
P.Oxy. 53, 3711 102
P.Oxy. 56, 3829 (30) 56
P.Oxy. 56, 3830 (50) 95
P.Oxy. 56, 3833 (42) 65
P.Oxy. 60, 4017 (4) 14
P.Oxy. 60, 4020 (25) 42
P.Oxy. 61, 4096 (53) 98
P.Oxy. 61, 4097 (61) 128
P.Oxy. 61, 4098 (71) 145
P.Oxy. 61, 4099 (66) 135
P.Oxy. 62, 4306 (69) 139
P.Oxy. 62, 4307 (72) 146
P.Oxy. 62, 4308 (58) 121
P.Oxy. 65, 4460 148
P.Pis. inv. 1 (32) 57
P.Robinson inv. 10 (62) 129
P.Ryl. 1, 19 73
P.Ryl. 1, 23 (40) 64
P.Ryl. 3, 540 74
P.Schub. 21 (54) 98
PSI 1, 19 56
PSI 8, 1000 (51) 96
PSI 10, 1173 (56) 99
PSI 11, 1211 138
PSI 11, 1219 (44) 77
PSI 12, 1286 (12) 17
P.Stras. gr. 1401 (39) 62
P.Stras. W.G. 332 (63) 130
P.Vindob.G. inv. 19766 (3) 14
P.Vindob.G. inv. 26727 (74) 147
P.Vindob.G. inv. 29779 (19) 34
P.Vindob.G. inv. 29784 (57) 101
P.Yale 2, 108 (67) 136
Pap.Lugd.Bat. 17, 18 (13) 18
Pap.Lugd.Bat. 25, 2 (10) 17
TAGP II 141

INDEX OF PASSAGES

Aeschylus
- hyp. *Aetnaeae* 36
- hyp. *Danaides* 36
- hyp. *Laius* 36
- hyp. *Phil.* 36

Aristophanes
- hyp. *Ach.* I 38

Callimachus 32, 49
- diegeses *Aetia* 1 77-79
- diegeses *Aetia* 3-4 76
- diegeses *Hymns* 1, 2 76
- diegeses *Iambi* 76
- diegeses *Lyrica* 76
- diegesis *Hecale* 76, 77, 79

Cratinus
- hyp. *Dionysalexandros* 36-37

Critias
- hyp. *Pirithous* 24

Euripides
- hyp. *Aeolus* 13
- hyp. *Alc.* 5, 13, 25, 27
- hyp. *Alex.* 13
- hyp. *Alope* 13
- hyp. *Andr.* 13, 14
- hyp. *Auge* 13, 25
- hyp. *Autolycus* 14
- hyp. *Ba.* 14
- hyp. *Bell.* 14
- hyp. *Busiris* 14
- hyp. *Chrys.* 20
- hyp. *El.* 15
- hyp. *Hel.* 5
- hyp. *Heracl.* 5
- hyp. *Hipp.* I 16, 22
- hyp. *Hipp.* II 5, 16
- hyp. *Hyps.* 19, 20
- hyp. *Med.* 5, 17, 20
- hyp. *Mel.S.* 17, 20, 24
- hyp. *Oed.* 20
- hyp. *Or.* 20
- hyp. *Palam.* 22
- hyp. *Peliades* 17, 20, 25
- hyp. *Ph.* 5, 20, 27
- hyp. *Phaëth.* 20
- hyp. *Phil.* 20
- hyp. *Phoenix* 20
- hyp. *Phrixus* 22
- hyp. *Phrixus* I 19, 20
- hyp. *Phrixus* II 20
- hyp. *Prot.* 25
- hyp. *Rh.* 18
- hyp. *Rhad.* 18
- hyp. *Sciron* 20
- hyp. *Scyrii* 18, 26, 29
- hyp. *Sthen.* 20, 22, 24
- hyp. *Syleus* 20, 25
- hyp. *Telephus* 20
- hyp. *Temenid.* 19, 20
- hyp. *Temenus* 20
- hyp. *Tennes* 20
- hyp. *Theseus* 22
- hyp. *Tr.* 7, 20

Hesiodus
- *Th.* 975-1018 121

Homerus
- hyp. *Il.* 1 55-57
- hyp. *Il.* 3 57
- hyp. *Il.* 7 58, 71
- hyp. *Il.* 7, 8 59
- hyp. *Il.* 10 71
- hyp. *Il.* 10-17 61
- hyp. *Il.* 11 60
- hyp. *Il.* 16 71
- hyp. *Il.* 20 61
- hyp. *Il.* 22, 23 62
- hyp. *Od.* 2, 3 62
- hyp. *Od.* 3, 6 64
- hyp. *Od.* 5, 6 65
- hyp. *Od.* 18 65

- sch. *Il.* 1, 22 104
- sch. *Il.* 1, 38-39 93
- sch. *Il.* 1, 42 108, 109
- sch. *Il.* 1, 59 108, 110
- sch. *Il.* 1, 126 108
- sch. *Il.* 1, 195 108, 109
- sch. *Il.* 1, 263 94

sch. *Il.* 1, 264 94
sch. *Il.* 1, 268 95
sch. *Il.* 1, 334 95, 105
sch. *Il.* 1, 366 95
sch. *Il.* 1, 399-400 95, 113
sch. *Il.* 2, 103 106, 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 2, 105b 108, 110
sch. *Il.* 2, 220 106
sch. *Il.* 2, 494 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 2, 547 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 2, 585 104
sch. *Il.* 2, 595 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 3, 175 104
sch. *Il.* 3, 250 104
sch. *Il.* 4, 195 104
sch. *Il.* 4, 219 104
sch. *Il.* 4, 378 104
sch. *Il.* 5, 385 101
sch. *Il.* 7, 8 95
sch. *Il.* 7, 44 95
sch. *Il.* 7, 86 95
sch. *Il.* 7, 468 96
sch. *Il.* 8, 284 96
sch. *Il.* 8, 368 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 8, 368-369 96
sch. *Il.* 8, 479 95
sch. *Il.* 9, 447 95
sch. *Il.* 11, 688 104
sch. *Il.* 11, 709 104
sch. *Il.* 11, 750 104
sch. *Il.* 12, 117 104
sch. *Il.* 13, 217-218 96
sch. *Il.* 13, 301 97
sch. *Il.* 13, 302 97
sch. *Il.* 13, 307 104, 108
sch. *Il.* 13, 459 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 120 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 226 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 255 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 274 104
sch. *Il.* 14, 295 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 319 97, 107-110
sch. *Il.* 14, 321 104
sch. *Il.* 14, 323-4 97
sch. *Il.* 14, 325 97, 108, 109
sch. *Il.* 14, 338 97
sch. *Il.* 15, 229 97
sch. *Il.* 16, 150 104
sch. *Il.* 16, 175 105
sch. *Il.* 16, 595 105
sch. *Il.* 18, 319 98
sch. *Il.* 18, 432 98
sch. *Il.* 18, 486 98
sch. *Il.* 19, 127 96
sch. *Il.* 19, 326 98
sch. *Il.* 20, 3 99
sch. *Il.* 20, 53 98
sch. *Il.* 20, 146 99
sch. *Il.* 20, 147 99
sch. *Il.* 20, 307 99
sch. *Il.* 20, 403-404 98, 99
sch. *Il.* 21, 194 98
sch. *Il.* 21, 448 98
sch. *Il.* 22, 29 98
sch. *Il.* 22, 126 98
sch. *Il.* 22, 397 104
sch. *Il.* 23, 92 98
sch. *Il.* 23, 141-142 98
sch. *Il.* 23, 346-347 98
sch. *Il.* 23, 383 104
sch. *Il.* 23, 683 98
sch. *Il.* 24, 24 98
sch. *Il.* 24, 602 98
sch. *Od.* 3, 4 100
sch. *Od.* 3, 91 100
sch. *Od.* 11, 318 101
sch. *Od.* 11, 321 100
sch. *Od.* 11, 322 100
sch. *Od.* 11, 326 100
sch. *Od.* 11, 519 100
sch. *Od.* 11, 582 100
sch. *Od.* 12, 69 100
sch. *Od.* 12, 70 100
sch. *Od.* 12, 85 100
sch. *Od.* 13, 96 100
sch. *Od.* 13, 259 100
sch. *Od.* 14, 327 100
sch. *Od.* 22, 299 105

Menander
hyp. *Demiurgus* 42
hyp. *Dis exapaton* 42
hyp. *Dyscolus* 43
hyp. *Epit.* 42
hyp. *Heauton Tim.* 41
hyp. *Her.* 44
hyp. *Iereia* 42
hyp. *Imbrioi* 42

Parthenius
Erot. Path. prologue XIV

Plutarchus
Aud. Poet. 14E 73

Ps.-Apollodorus
Bibl. prologue XIII
Bibl. 1, 3, 6 109
Bibl. 2, 1, 3 109
Bibl. 2, 1, 4 109
Bibl. 2, 4, 1 110
Bibl. 3, 14, 6 109
Epit. 2, 10-12 110
Epit. 3, 11-14 124
Epit. 3, 17 110
Epit. 4 70
Epit. 4, 3-7 177
Epit. 7, 2-33 72
Epit. 7, 26-30 127

Ps.-Hyginus
Fab. 97 125
Fab. 106 72
Fab. 125 72
Fab. 225 140

Quintilianus
Inst. 1, 8, 18 117

Sophocles
hyp. *Aj.* 35
hyp. *Naupl. Cat.* 21
hyp. *Niobe* 21
hyp. *OC* 35
hyp. *OT* 35, 41
hyp. *Ph.* 35, 41
hyp. *Tereus* 21
hyp. *Tr.* 108

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

English

abbreviations in papyri 36, 39, 46, 58, 81
Achilles
  golden vase of (53) 98
  on Scyros (54) 98
  sacrifice of hair (53) 98
Actaeon, metamorphosis of (70) 144
Actaeon's dogs (65) 134
aegis (52) 97
Aenea, founded by Aeneas (52) 97
Aeneas (55) 99
Aethyiae, metamorphosis of (70) 144
Aglauros, metamorphosis of (70) 144
Alcippe (74) 147
Alcyone, metamorphosis of (70) 144
alphabetic order 3
  in catalogues 129, 132, 139, 144, 146, 150, 155
  in Ps.-Hyginus 152, 171
  of hypp. 2, 23, 31, 40, 49, 51
Amalthea (52) 97
Amalthea, horn of (53) 98
Ampelius *Liber Memorialis* 138
Amphithea (74) 148
Amphitrite (56) 100
Antoninus Liberalis
  ascriptions 113
Apollo (54) 99
Apollo Smintheus (48) 93
Apollodorus of Athens 26, 106, 114, 124, 141, 156
Areopagus (69) 143
Arethusa, metamorphosis of (70) 144
Argo (56) 100
Argonauts, list of (60, 61) 128, 129
Ariadne (56) 100
Arion (53) 98
Aristophanes, hypp. 37, 41
Aristophanes of Byz. 32, 41, 44
Aristoteles 2, 49, 120, 156
  Peplus 124, 133, 143, 153
Arithous (50) 95
Ascalaphus, metamorphosis of (70) 144
Asclepius, daughters of (74) 147
authorship
  descriptive hypp. 37
  Homeric hypp. 82
  learned hypp. 32
  Menandrean hypp. 40
  metrical hypp. 41
  narrative hypp. 2, 12

builders of temples, list of (69) 140

Caeneus (49) 94
Callicolone (53, 54) 98
Callimachus 32, 49
  incipits 2
  Scholia Florentina 77
Calydon (51) 96
Calydonian boar-hunters (61, 62, 74) 129, 130, 148
Cassandra (50) 95
catalogues
  function of 156
  geographical 138
  in Ps.-Apollodorus 155
  in Ps.-Clemens 133, 155
  in Ps.-Hyginus *Fab.* 151
  of inventions 120
  Ps.-Hesiodic 133
  readership of 156
catechism 56
Charites (66) 136
children of gods, see unions
Chimaera (65) 134
Cilla (48) 93
Clemens Al. 133, 155
Clymene (56) 100
column width 23, 66, 102, 149

Danae (52) 97
Danaids (60) 127
Dicaearchus 1, 3, 4, 32, 50
didascalic information 32, 34, 39
diegeses, cf. also Callimachus 74ff.
digest XV, 51, 161
Dodona (56) 100

Dorus, daughters of (74) 147

Epigoni (66) 135
epithets, list of (69) 141
Erigone (53) 98
etymology 141
Eumenides (66) 136
Euripides, popularity of 2
Eurypylus (56) 100

focalization 12, 90, 172, 175

games, institutions of (67, 69) 136, 142
Giants and Zeus (50) 95
gods, list of 148
Gorgones (66) 136
grammarians, list of (68) 138
Greek leaders, list of (60) 126

Halirrothius (74) 147
Harpies (66) 136
heading
  of catalogues 127, 130, 134, 138, 140, 147, 149
  of hypp. 23, 39, 53, 66
Helenus (50) 95
Heliconion (55) 99
Hellespont (50) 95
Heracles
  and Laomedon (55) 99
  victims of (71) 145
Hermes (53) 98
heroes, list of (62) 130
Hesperides (66) 136
heuremata 143
historiae 86, 117
Homeric heroes, list of 148
Homeric catalogue of ships 124, 126
Homerus
  D-scholia 85
  editions of med. hypp. 67
  number of days of *Il.* 1 55
  summaries 69
Horai (66) 136
Hydra 134
hypotheses
  discourse 54
  hybrid 55
  metrical 40
  nominal 54
  saga-hypp. 32
  See also Index of passages on: Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Cratinus, Critias, Euripides, Homerus, Menander, Sophocles

Icarius (53) 98
Idomeneus (56) 100
incipits 2, 23, 39, 49, 66
index personarum 34, 44
institutions of games (67, 69) 136, 142
inventions concerning warfare (68) 138
inventors, list of (69) 142
Iolaus (Argonaut) 129

Jason (56) 100

Laomedon (54, 55) 99
lemma 85
Leucippus, daughters of (74) 148
librarians, list of (68) 138
lists, see catalogues

Maas's Law 75
Maera (56) 100
men involved with cult of gods (73) 147
metamorphoses (69, 70) 141, 144
Moirai (66) 136
monsters, list of (65) 134
murderers tried in Areopagus (69) 143
murderous mothers (72) 146
Muses, unions of (63) 130
Mythographus Homericus 85ff.
  author 92
  contents 86
  function 117
  in scholia 103
  readership 118
  syntax, vocabulary 88ff.

Nausithous 130
Niobe (53) 98
Nymphs (66) 136

Oenotropoi (74) 148
Olympian victors 131
oracles 143
Otus and Ephialtes (57) 101
Oxyrhynchus, scribes from 138
  papyri fr. 22, 45, 65, 80, 101, 148

painters, list of (68) 138

Parthenius *Erot. Path.*
  ascriptions 113, 173
  notes on contents 172
  syntax, vocabulary 173
Patroclus, see victors Patr.-games
Pelias, see victors Pelias-games
periochae 40, 69
Phaedra (56) 100
Pherae (59) 123
Philoctetes (59) 122
Phlegyae (52) 97
Phocus (53) 98, 129
Phoenix (50) 95
Phorcys (56) 100
Pirithous (49) 94
Pleiades (53) 98
Pleuron (51) 96
Priasus (Argonaut) 129
priests (73) 147
Procris (56) 100
provenance of papyri 22, 45, 65, 80, 101, 148, 163
Ps.-Apollodorus *Bibl.*
  catalogues 155
  epitomes 167
  link with MH sch. 108
  link with narrative hypp. 26
  notes on contents 164
  readership 167
  sources of 27
  syntax, vocabulary 165, 166
Ps.-Ausonius 69
Ps.-Clemens 133
Ps.-Dositheus 69, 153
Ps.-Hyginus *Fab.* 28
  catalogues 151, 155
  link with narrative hypp. 29
  notes on contents 169
  readership 154
  syntax, vocabulary 171
Pylos (56) 100

rebellion of gods against Zeus (49) 95
running naked, origin of (53) 98

sacrifices, list of (69) 140
Sallustius 35
scholarship 31, 41, 49, 50, 83, 114-116, 120, 139, 150, 153-155
scholia
  Il.-sch. derived from Apd. 107, 108
  on A.R. compared with Apd. 110
  on Lyc. derived from Apd. 107
  on Plato derived from Apd. 108
school text 14, 16, 18, 20, 31, 44, 57, 58, 61, 63, 96, 136, 147, 148, 161
sculptors, list of (68) 138
Scylla (56) 100
Sellius 40, 50
seven wise men, sentences of (66) 136
seven world wonders 138
ships, list of (59) 123
Sirens (66) 136
sons of gods, list of (69) 142
subliterary papyri XIII
suitors of Penelope (60) 127
Symmachus 37, 50

Tabulae Iliacae 70, 71
  Tab. Il. Capitolina (= 1A) 70, 176
Tales from Euripides 1
Tantalus (56) 100
Telemachus (56) 100
Telephus (59) 122
temples, see builders
Tenedos (48) 93
tenses
  in diegeses 76
  in Hom. hypp. 54, 68
  in MH 89
  in narr. hypp. 8
  in synopses 8
Thersanor (Argonaut) 129
Theseus and Ariadne (56) 100
Thessalians (52) 97
Thestius, children of (74) 148
Titanides (66) 136
Tityus (57) 101
Tzetzes 107

unions
  of goddesses and mortals (58) 121
  of gods 133
  of Muses (63) 130
  of Zeus (64) 132

victims of Heracles (71) 145
victors Olympian games 131
victors Patroclus-games (69) 143
victors Pelias-games (63, 69) 131, 142

world wonders 138

Zenobius 97, 107
Zeus, see also unions
  and Giants (50) 95
  gods against (49) 95

Greek

῞Αβας (16 fr. 5)
῞Αβδηρα (43 col. II)
᾿Αγαμέμνων (12; 16 fr. 11, 13; 29-32; 34; 36; 47)
᾿Αγασθένης (16 fr. 10)
᾿Αγχίσης (52)
῎Αδραστος (15; 56 fr. 4)
᾿Αθάμας (14; 16 fr. 14.3, 17.2; 50)
᾿Αθηνᾶ (12; 16 fr. 13, 17.1; 22; 30; 37; 39-41 43 col. V; 56 fr. 7)
᾿Αθῆναι (18; 53 fr. 3; 55; 56 fr. 3)
῎Αθως (52)
Αἴαντες (34; 36)
Αἴας (16 fr. 13; 34; 36)
Αἰγαίων (49)
Αἰγεύς (9; 43 col. X)
Αἴγινα (43 col. VIII)
Αἴγισθος (16 fr. 3)
Αἰθιοπία (29)
Αἰνείας (37; 52)
Αἶνος (43 col. VII-VIII)
Αἴολος (1a; 14; 16 fr. 14.3; 50)
Αἴσωπος (43 col. VI)
αἰτία 79
Αἴτνη (21)
Αἰτωλός (51)
᾿Ακόντιος (43 col. Z)
᾿Ακρίσιος (16 fr. 5)
᾿Αλέξανδρος (1b; 12; 22; 30; 32)
᾿Αλίαρτος (53 fr. 10)
῎Αλκηστις (1a)
᾿Αλκίνοος (40; 41)
᾿Αλκμαίων (56 fr. 4)
᾿Αμάλθεια (52; 53 fr. 4)
᾿Αμύντωρ (16 fr. 14.4; 50)
᾿Αμφάλκης (43 col. VI)
᾿Αμφιάραος (16 fr. 14.2-15; 56 fr. 4)
᾿Αμφιτρίτη (56 fr. 1)
᾿Αμφίων (17; 52; 56 fr. 3)
᾿Ανάφη (44)
᾿Ανδρόγευς (43 col. V; 44)
᾿Ανδρομάχη (1b)
᾿Αντήνωρ (30)
᾿Αντιγόνη (43 col. V)
᾿Αντίλοχος (36)
᾿Απόλλων (16 fr. 4, 14.1; 17; 29-31; 36; 37; 43 col. I, II, VI, VIII-XI; 44; 47; 49; 50; 52; 53 fr. 3, 5-6; 54)
᾿Απολλώνιος (43 col. VII)
᾿Αργεία (16 fr. 9)
᾿Αργοναῦται (43 col. V, VIII)
῎Αργος (15; 16 fr. 4, 9; 43 col. IV; 52)
᾿Αργώ (56 fr. 5-6)
῎Αρης (16 fr. *Ph.*; 37)
᾿Αριάδνη (56 fr. 3)
᾿Αριστόδημος (16 fr. 9)
᾿Αρίων (53 fr. 10)
᾿Αρκαδία (2; 47; 53 fr. 11)
᾿Αρνεῖος μήν (45)
῞Αρπυιαι (56 fr. 6)
᾿Αρσινόη (43 col. X)
῎Αρτεμις (12; 17; 37; 43 col. Z, I, III, IX; 45; 57)
᾿Αρύμνιον ὄρος (56 fr. 7)
᾿Αρχέλαος (13; 16 fr. 9)
᾿Αρχέμορος (14)
᾿Ασία (30)
῎Ασπενδος (43 col. IX)
᾿Αστύοχη (56 fr. 4)
῎Ατλας (53 fr. 1, 11)
Αὔγη (2)
Αὐτόλυκος (3)
᾿Αφροδίτη (8; 12; 22; 30; 36; 37; 52; 56 fr. 3)
᾿Αχιλλεύς (12; 21; 29; 36; 37; 53 fr. 10; 54)

Βαθυκλῆς (43 col. VI)
Βάκχαι (4)
Βάττος (43 col. XI-XII)
Βελλεροφόντης (5; 16 fr. 5-6a)
Βερενίκη (43 col. V)
Βίας (43 col. VI)
Βοιωτία (53 fr. 10)
Βούσειρις (5)
Βράγχος (43 col. X)

Βρισηΐς (29)

Γάϊος (43 col. V)
Γῆ (50)
Γίγαντες (53 fr. 1)
Γλαύκη (9)
Γοργίας (27)

Δανάη (52)
Δελφοί (1b; 14)
Δηιδάμεια (12)
Δηϊονεύς (56 fr. 2)
Δηΐφοβος (1b)
Δῆλος (43 col. XI)
Δία (49)
διδασκαλικά 34
διήγημα 19
διήγησις 74
Διομήδης (12; 34; 36)
Διονυσαλέξανδρος (22)
Διόνυσος (4; 16 fr. 17.3; 22; 43 col. IV; 44; 56 fr. 3)
Διόσκουροι (43 col. X)
Δόλων (30; 36)
Δωδώνη (56 fr. 7)

Εἰλείθυια (43 col. I)
Ἑκάβη (1b; 50)
Ἑκάλη (43 col. X; 46)
Ἑκάτη (56 fr. 6)
Ἕκτωρ (12; 30; 34; 36; 38)
Ἔλατος (49)
ἐλαφηβόλος Ἄρτεμις (53 fr. 2)
Ἑλένη (12; 16 fr. 4; 22; 32; 43 col. X; 47)
Ἕλενος (16 fr. 17.1; 30; 50)
Ἑλίκη (53 fr. 3; 55)
Ἑλικών (44)
Ἑλικώνιος (53 fr. 3; 55)
Ἕλλη (14; 16 fr. 14.3, 17.2-3; 50)
Ἕλλην (10)
Ἐνδυμίων (51)
ἐντεῦθεν 79
Ἐπιάλτης (57)
ἐπιγραφή 57
Ἐρεχθεύς (56 fr. 2)
Ἐρινύς (53 fr. 10)
Ἔρις (30)
Ἐριφύλη (56 fr. 4)
Ἑρμῆς (16 fr. 7; 22; 30; 37; 41; 43 col. VII-VIII; 53 fr. 11)
Ἑρμιόνη (1b; 16 fr. 4)
Ἐτεοκλῆς (15; 16 fr. 17.3)
Εὐάνθη (44)
Εὔδημος (43 col. VI)
Εὐθύδημος (43 col. VI)
Εὐθυκλῆς (43 col. I-II)
Εὔθυμος (43 col. IV)
Εὐμήδης (30)
εὑρήματα 120, 144, 153
Εὐρυδίκη (16 fr. 2)
Εὐρύμαχος (42; 52)
Εὐρυνόμη (44)
Εὐρύπυλος (34; 35; 56 fr. 4)
Εὔρυτος (16 fr. *Syleus*)
Εὔφορβος (36)
εὐψυχότα[τοι] (heroes) 130

Ζεύς (14; 16 fr. *Syleus*; 29; 30; 33; 36; 43 col. I, II, IV, VII, XI; 44; 49; 50; 52; 53 fr. 2, 11; 56 fr. 3, 5)
Ζῆθος (17; 52; 56 fr. 3)

Ἥβη (43 col. IX)
Ἠλέκτρα (6; 16 fr. 4; 53 fr. 1)
Ἥλιος (16 fr. 14.5; 56 fr. 4)
Ἦλις (43 col. I, VIII)
Ἥρα (22; 29; 30; 36; 37; 43 col. IV; 44; 49; 50)
Ἡραῖον (43 col. IV)
Ἡρακλεῖδαι (13)
Ἡρακλῆς (13; 16 fr. 5, *Syleus*, 17.1; 43 col. IV; 44; 49; 55; 56 fr. 4)
Ἥφαιστος (29; 37; 53 fr. 8)

Θαλῆς (43 col. VI)
Θειοδάμας (44)
Θέμις (30; 52)
Θέτις (12; 29; 30; 53 fr. 8)
Θετταλία (7; 16 fr. 14.3)
Θῆβαι (4; 15; 16 fr. 17.3; 50; 56 fr. 3, 4)
Θησεύς (7; 8; 43 col. X; 56 fr. 3)
Θόας (34)
Θορικός (56 fr. 2)
Θρᾴκη (18)

Ἰάσων (44; 56 fr. 5-6)
Ἰδαῖος (30)
Ἴδη (22; 36)
Ἰδομενεύς (34)
Ἰθάκη (56 fr. 7)
Ἰκάριος (39)

Ἴλιον (12; 16 fr. 13; 40; 53 fr. 16; 54)
Ἴμβρος (26)
Ἰνώ (14; 16 fr. 14.3, 16, 17.2; 43 col. III; 50)
Ἰοκάςτη (16 fr. 17.4)
Ἵππη (16 fr. 2)
Ἱπποδαμεία (48; 50)
Ἱππολύτη (8)
Ἱππόλυτος (7; 8)
Ἵππου καὶ Κόρης (43 col. III)
Ἱππῶναξ (43 col. VI)
ἱςτορία 85
Ἴτυς (18)
Ἴφιτος (16 fr. *Syleus*)
Ἰωλκός (9; 56 fr. 5)
Ἴων τραγικός (43 col. IX)

Κάδμος (4; 14; 16 fr. 14.3, 17.2; 50)
Καινεύς (49)
Καλλικολώνη (53 fr. 16; 54)
Καλλιόπη (12)
Καλυψώ (41)
Κάλχας (29; 56 fr. 7)
Κανάκη (1)
Καρία (16 fr. 5)
Καςςάνδρα (1b; 16 fr. 13; 30; 50)
Κένταυροι (49)
κεφάλαιον 33
Κεφαλληνία (56 fr. 7)
Κέφαλος (56 fr. 2)
Κιθαιρών (4)
Κίλλα (48)
Κίλλος (48)
Κλεύβουλος (43 col. VI)
Κλέων (43 col. VIII)
Κλυμένη (56 fr. 4)
Κλυταιμνήςτρα (16 fr. 3)
Κνήμων (27)
Κόδρος (53 fr. 3; 55)
Κολοφών (56 fr. 7)
Κόλχοι (16 fr. 17.3; 56 fr. 5)
Κοννίδας (43 col. IX)
Κόνων (43 col. V)
Κοπρεύς (53 fr. 10)
Κόρινθος (9; 16 fr. 5)
Κορωνίς (44)
Κραταιΐς (56 fr. 6)
Κρεςφόντης (16 fr. 9)
Κρέων (9; 15; 16 fr. 17.4)
Κρηθεύς (16 fr. 2; 56 fr. 5)
Κρῖνις (48)
Κρόνος (50)
Κυδίππη (43 col. Z)
Κύζικος (43 col. V)
Κυλλήνη (53 fr. 11)
Κυρήνη (43 col. XI-XII)

Λάϊος (20 fr. 1)
Λακεδαίμων (22; 39; 40)
Λαομέδων (49; 55)
Λαπίθαι (49)
Λέαρχος (50)
Λειμώνη (43 col. III)
Λέλεγες (43 col. III)
Λεοντῖνοι (21)
Λέςβος (43 col. III; 48)
Λευκαδία (45)
Λευκάς (45)
Λευκόφρυς (48)
Λῆμνος (16 fr. 17.1; 34; 43 col. X)
Λητώ (17; 37)
Λίνδος (44)
Λοκρός (56 fr. 3)
Λυκία (5)
Λυκομήδης (12; 54)
Λυκοῦργος (16 fr. 14.2)

Μαῖα (53 fr. 11)
Μαινάδες (16 fr. 17.3)
Μαῖρα (56 fr. 3)
Μακαρεύς (1a)
Μαλέα (49)
Μελανίππη (10; 16 fr. 2)
Μελικέρτης (43 col. III; 50)
μέν-δέ 7, 30, 174
Μενέλαος (1b; 16 fr. 113 *Or.*; 32; 36; 39)
Μενοικεύς (15; 16 fr. *Ph.*)
Μερόπη (53 fr. 1)
Μέροψ (16 fr. 14.5)
Μεςςήνη (16 fr. 11)
Μεςςηνία (16 fr. 9-10)
Μήδεια (9; 43 col. X)
Μῆλος (16 fr. 6a)
Μίλητος (53 fr. 3)
Μίνως (8; 44)
Μολοςςοί (1b)
Μοῦςαι (44; 52)
Μόψος (43 col. IX)
μυθοποιΐα 33

Ναύπλιος (17)
Ναυςικάα (40; 41)

Νέδη (43 col. XI)
Νεοπτόλεμος (1b; 20 fr. 5)
Νέςτωρ (34)
Νεφέλη (16 fr. 14.3, 17.2-3; 50)
Νηλεύς (53 fr. 3; 55; 56 fr. 5)
Νιόβη (17)
νόμιος Ἀπόλλων (53 fr. 5)

Ξάνθος (37)
Ξουθία (21)

Ὀδυςςεύς (16 fr. 17.1; 20 fr. 5; 34; 39; 42; 43 col. IV; 54; 56 fr. 1)
Οἴαξ (17)
Οἰδίπους (16 fr. 4, 17.4)
Οἰνόμαος (48)
Οἰςύδρης (43 col. V)
Ὄξυλος (16 fr. 9)
Ὀρέςτης (1b; 6; 13; 16 fr. 3-4, 11; 43 col. III)
Ὄρςιππος (53 fr. 11)
Ὀρχομενός (16 fr. 17.2)
οὗ/ῆς/ὧν ἀρχή 2, 39
Οὐρανός (44; 50)

Πάλλας (8)
Παμφυλία (43 col. IX)
Πανδίων (18)
Πάρις (1b)
Παρμενίων (43 col. VI)
Πάρος (44)
Παρραςία (43 col. XI)
Παςικλῆς (43 col. IV)
Πάτροκλος (35; 36)
Πειραιεύς (43 col. V)
Πελειάδες (11)
Πελίας (9; 11; 56 fr. 5)
Πελοπόννηςςος (16 fr. 9; 49)
Πέλοψ (48)
Περίανδρος (43 col. VI)
περιοχή 40
Περςικά 145
Περφεραῖος Ἑρμῆς (43 col. VIII)
Πευκέτιοι (43 col. V)
Πηλεύς (1b; 4; 30)
Πήλιον (30; 49)
Πηνειός (43 col. II)
Πηνελόπη (42)
Πίςα (48)
Πιττακός (43 col. VI)
Πλαγκταὶ πέτραι (56 fr. 5-6)
Πληϊάδες (53 fr. 1)
Πληϊόνη (53 fr. 1)
Πολυδεύκης (12)
Πολυκλῆς (43 col. VIII)
Πολυνείκης (15; 16 fr. 17.3-4)
Ποςειδῶν (8; 16 fr. 2, 6b, 13; 36; 37; 48; 49; 53 fr. 10; 56 fr. 3, 5)
Πουλυδάμας (30)
Πριαμίδαι (55)
Πρίαμος (1b; 30; 50)
(προ)ειρημένος 9
Προῖτος (16 fr. 5-6a)
Προκλῆς (43 col. IV)
Πρόκνη (18)
Πρόκρις (56 fr. 2)
Πρωτεςίλαος (36)
Πυθώ (43 col. II)
Πυλάδης (16 fr. 4)
Πύλος (39; 56 fr. 1)

Ῥαδάμανθυς (12)
Ῥέα (43 col. XI; 52)
Ῥῆςος (12; 36)
Ῥώμη (43 col. V)

Cαλμωνεύς (16 fr. 2; 56 fr. 5)
Cαραπίδειον (43 col. VI)
Cαρπηδών (36)
Cελινοῦς (43 col. IX)
Cεμέλη (4)
Cθενέβοια (4; 16 fr. 5)
Cθένελος (56 fr. 7)
Cικελία (43 col. IX)
Cιμόεις (54)
Cῖμος (43 col. VII)
Cίπυλος (56 fr. 5)
Cίςυφος (16 fr. 2)
Cκάμανδρος (43 col. VIII)
Cκείρων (16 fr. 6b)
ςκοπός 33-34
Cκύλλα (56 fr. 6)
Cκύριοι (12)
Cκῦρος (54)
Cόλων (43 col. VI)
Cπάρτη (1b; 16 fr. 10-11)
Cτρυμών (12)
Cυλεύς (16 frr. *Syleus*)
Cυρακοῦςςαι (21)
Cυρία (43 col. V)
Cώςτρατος (27)

Ταλαός (56 fr. 4)
Τάνταλος (48)
Τειρεσίας (15; 16 fr. *Ph.*)
Τελχῖνες (44)
Τεμέση (43 col. IV)
Τένεδος (16 fr. 14.1; 43 col. III; 48)
Τέννης (16 fr. 14.1)
Τεῦκρος (34)
Τηλέμαχος (38-40; 56 fr. 1)
Τήλεφος (56 fr. 4)
Τημενίδαι (13)
Τήμενος (13; 16 fr. 8-11)
Τηρεύς (18)
Τιλφωσαίη (53 fr. 10)
Τίρυνς (16 fr. 5-6a)
Τισαμενός (13)
Τμῶλος (43 col. VII)
Τριποδίσκος (45)
Τροία (52)
Τροιζήν (7; 8; 43 col. X)
Τυρρηνία (1a)
Τυρώ (56 fr. 5)
τῶν καθ' (ἑ)*αυτὸν* + superl. 91

Ὑδροφόρια (43 col. VIII)
ὑπόθεσις 1, 2, 33, 39, 53
Ὑψιπύλη (16 fr. 14.1)

Φαέθων (16 fr. 14.5; 56 fr. 4)
Φαίδρα (7; 8)
Φάρσαλος (53 fr. 10)
Φειδίας (43 col. VII)
Φιλητάδας (43 col. VIII)
Φιλοκτήτης (16 fr. 17.1; 19; 20 fr. 5)
Φιλομήλα (18)
Φίλτων (43 col. VI)
Φινεύς (56 fr. 6)
Φλεγύαι (52)
Φοῖνιξ (16 fr. 14.4; 50)
Φόρκυν (56 fr. 6-7)
Φρίξος (14; 16 fr. 14.3, 17.2-3; 50)
Φρυγία (53 fr. 11)
Φῶκος (53 fr. 1)

Χάριτες (44)
Χείρων (30; 56 fr. 5)
Χίλων (43 col. VI)
Χλωρίς (56 fr. 1)
Χρυσηΐς (29; 30)
Χρύσης (29; 30)

Ὠκεανός (44; 53 fr. 1)
Ὦτος (57)